National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXVI. NO. 41. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1866. WHOLE NO. 1,341.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT $3.00 PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, No. 48 Beekman Street, New York

☞ ALL LETTERS on Business, or for Publication, should be addressed to PARKER PILLSBURY, *Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard*, 48 Beekman st., New York.

CLUB RATES.—Ten copies to one address, $2.50 each; twenty copies $2 each.

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

ROBERT J. JOHNSTON, PRINTER,

No. 33 BEEKMAN STREET, N. Y.

SPEECH

OF THE

HON. CHARLES SUMNER

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

In the Senate of the United States, Washington, February 6th and 7th, 1866.

[We give below the material portions of Mr. Sumner's speech in the Senate on the 6th and 7th inst., in full, with a careful digest of the historical argument and illustration with which he fortified the positions he assumed, and which, though full of research and interest, are not absolutely essential to its completeness, and would make it too long for publication in the columns of THE STANDARD.]

THE Senate took up for consideration the following proposition:

A JOINT RESOLUTION *carrying out the guarantee of a republican form of government in the Constitution of the United States, and enforcing the Constitutional Amendment for the prohibition of slavery.*

Whereas, It is provided in the Constitution that the United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government; and *whereas*, by reason of the failure of certain States to maintain governments which Congress could recognize, it has become the duty of the United States, standing in the place of guarantor, where the principle has made a lapse, to secure to such States, according to the requirement of the guarantee, governments republican in form; and *whereas*, further, it is provided in a recent Constitutional Amendment that Congress may "enforce" the prohibition of slavery by "appropriate legislation," and it is important to this end, that all relics of slavery should be removed, including all distinction of rights on account of color; now, therefore, to carry out the guarantee of a republican form of government and to enforce the prohibition of slavery,

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be no Oligarchy, Aristocracy, Caste or Monopoly invested with peculiar privileges and powers, and there shall be no denial of rights, civil or political, on account of color or race anywhere within the limits of the United States or the jurisdiction thereof; but all persons therein shall be equal before the law, whether in the court-room or at the ballot-box. And this statute, made in pursuance to the Constitution, shall be the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

On this proposition Mr. SUMNER spoke as follows:

MR. PRESIDENT: In opening this great question, I begin by expressing a heartfelt aspiration that the day may soon come when the States lately in rebellion may be received again into the copartnership of political power and the full fellowship of the Union. But I see too well that it is vain to expect this day, which is so much longed for, until we have obtained that security for the future which is found only in the Equal Rights of all, whether in the court-room or at the ballot-box. This is the Great Guarantee, without which all other guarantees will fail. This is the sole solution of our present troubles and anxieties. This is the only sufficient assurance of peace and reconciliation. To the establishment of this Great Guarantee, as a measure of safety and justice, I now ask your best attention.

The powers of Congress over this subject are as ample as they are beneficent. From four specific fountains they flow—each one sufficient for the purpose—all four swelling into an irresistible current, and tending to one conclusion; first, *the necessity of the case*, by which, according to the analogies of the "Territories," disloyal States, having no local government, lapse under the authority of Congress; secondly, the *Rights of War*, which do not expire or lose their grasp, except with the establishment of all needful guarantees; thirdly, the Constitutional injunction to guarantee a republican form of government; and, fourthly, the Constitutional Amendment by which Congress, in words of peculiar energy, is empowered "to enforce" the abolition of slavery "by appropriate legislation." According to the proverb of Catholic Europe, all roads lead to Rome, and so do all these powers lead to the jurisdiction of Congress over this whole subject. No matter which road you take, you arrive at the same point. Two of these powers have already been discussed exhaustively. The latter have been less considered, and it is on these that I shall speak especially to-day. I propose, with the permission of the Senate, to show the necessity and duty of exercising the jurisdiction of Congress so as to secure that essential condition of a republican government, the Equal Rights of All. And I put aside, at the outset, that metaphysical question worthy of the schoolmen in the dark ages, whether certain States are *in* the Union or *out* of the Union. This is a question of form, not of substance; of words only and not of facts; for the substance is clear and the facts are unanswerable. All are agreed, according to the authority of President Lincoln, in his latest utterance before his lamented death, that these States have ceased to be "in practical relations with the Union;" and this is enough to sustain the jurisdiction of Congress, even without the plain words of the Constitution in two separate texts.

Necessity and duty commingle. If what is necessary is not always according to duty, surely duty is always a necessity. On the present occasion they unite in one voice for the Great Guarantee. It is at once a necessity and a duty. Glancing at the promises of the fathers, I shall exhibit: first, the overruling necessity of the times; and secondly, the positive mandate of the Constitution, compelling us to guarantee "a republican form of government" and thus to determine what is meant by this requirement; all of which has been fortified by the Constitutional Amendment authorizing Congress to enforce the abolition of Slavery.

PROMISES OF THE FATHERS.

In the life of a nation, as in that of an individual, there are special moments when outstanding promises must be performed under peril of ruin and dishonor. Such is the present moment in the life of our Republic. There are sacred promises beginning with our history yet unperformed, and now the hour has sounded when continued failure on our part will open the door to a long train of woes. And there are yet other promises recently made for the national defence against a wicked Rebellion which, like those of an earlier date, are unperformed also. But the latter are all included in the former, so that our whole duty now centres in the performance of those sacred promises which are coeval with the national life.

Our fathers solemnly announced the Equal Rights of all men, and that government had no just foundation except in the consent of the governed; and to the support of the Declaration, heralding these self-evident truths, they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. Looking at this Declaration now, it is chiefly memorable for the promises it then made. Mighty words! Fit utterance for the giant infant then born. Fit device for the great Republic taking its place in the family of kings. Fit lesson for mankind. And now the moment has come when these vows must be fulfilled to the letter. In securing the Equal Rights of the freedman, and his participation in the government, which he is taxed to support, we shall perform those early promises of the fathers, and at the same time the supplementary promises only recently made to the freedman as the condition of alliance and aid against the Rebellion. A failure to perform these promises is moral and political bankruptcy. It is repudiation of moral and political duties, ending in the repudiation of the financial obligations of the country. So are your duties to the national freedman linked with your obligations to the national creditor, that you cannot repudiate the former without impairing the value of the latter. Whoever disowns any of the promises of the Republic leads the way in repudiation.

But you cannot be thus guilty. Even if indifferent to the vows of the fathers, necessity, in harmony with the plain injunction of the Constitution, will constrain you. On this there can be no doubt. You must perform these promises, and this brings me to the overruling necessity of the times.

OVERRULING NECESSITY OF THE TIMES.

I. Necessity is a peremptory instructor. It gives the law which no man can disregard. It will not hearken to apology or postponement. With a voice of command it insists that its behests shall be obeyed. And now this very necessity speaks to us with familiar tones.

Twice already, since rebel Slavery rose against the Republic, it has spoken to us, insisting: first, that the slaves should be declared free; and secondly, that muskets should be put into their hands for the common defence. Yielding to necessity, these two things were done. Reason, humanity, justice were powerless in this behalf; but necessity was irresistible. And the result testifies how wisely the Republic acted. Without emancipation, followed by the arming of the slaves, rebel slavery would not have been overcome. With these the victory was easy.

At last, the same necessity which insisted first upon emancipation and then upon the arming of the slaves, insists, with the same unanswerable force upon the admission of the freedman to complete Equality before the law, so that there shall be no ban of color in court or at the ballot-box, and government shall be fixed on its only rightful foundation—the consent of the governed. Reason, humanity, and justice—all of which are clear for this admission of the freedman—may fail to move you; but you must yield to necessity, which now requires that these promises shall be performed.

The demand which I now make stands on necessity. You must grant it or you will peril the peace of this Republic, and postpone indefinitely the great day of security and reconciliation. Therefore, in the name of that national safety, which is the supreme law, I begin my appeal. Whatever is required for the national safety is Constitutional. Not only it *may* be done, but it *must* be done. Not to do it is to fail in duty. This Republic must be saved.

When I speak of necessity, I mean that overruling compulsion which cannot be disobeyed. In the present case it is compounded of moral duty and the instinct of self-preservation. The moral duty to perform these promises is as plain as the decalogue. The instinct of self-preservation, impelling us to save the Republic, is in harmony with the requirements of moral duty. In denying justice now, you will not only be guilty of grievous wrong, but you will expose your country to incalculable calamity. The case is too clear for debate.

The irresistible argument for Emancipation was always two-fold: first, its intrinsic justice, and secondly, its necessity for the safety of the Republic; all of which was expressed by President Lincoln in the closing words of his great Proclamation, when he said: "and upon this act, sincerely believed to be *an act of justice warranted by the Constitution upon military necessity*, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God." But the argument for Enfranchisement, which is nothing but the complement of Emancipation, is the same. Enfranchisement is not only intrinsically just, but it is necessary to the safety of the Republic. There is no reason, point or suggestion once urged for Emancipation which may not be urged now for Enfranchisement. I shall not err if I say that Emancipation itself will fail without Enfranchisement.

By Enfranchisement, I mean the establishment of the Equal Rights of all, so that there shall be no exclusion of any kind, civil or political, founded on color, and the promises of the fathers shall be fulfilled. Such an act will be, in the words of President Lincoln, "an act of justice warranted by the Constitution upon military necessity."

As an act of justice, Enfranchisement has a necessity of its own. No individual and no people can afford to be unjust. Such an offence will carry with it a curse which, sooner or later, must drag its perpetrator to the earth. But here the necessity from considerations of justice is completed and intensified by the positive requirement of the national safety, plainly involved in the performance of these promises.

Look at the unhappy freedman blasted by the ban of exclusion. He has always been loyal, and now it is he, and not the rebel master, who pays the penalty. From the nature of the case, he must be discontented, restless, anxious, smarting with a sense of wrong and a consciousness of rights denied. He will not work as if taken by the hand and made to feel the grasp of friendship. He will be idle, thriftless, unproductive. Industry will suffer. Cotton will not grow. Commerce will not thrive. Credit will fail; nay, it will die before it is born. On the other hand, his rebel master, with hands still red with the blood of his fellow-countrymen, will be encouraged in that assumption of superiority which is a part of the Barbarism of slavery; he will predominate as in times past; he will be exacting as of old; he will be harsh, cruel and vindictive; he will make the unprotected and trembling freedman suffer for the losses and disappointments of the Rebellion; he will continue to insult and prostitute the wife and children who, in ceasing to be chattels, have not ceased to be dependants; he will follow the freedman to by-ways and to obscure places, where he will once again play the master and assert his ancient title as lord of the lash. Scenes of savage brutality and blood must ensue. All this, which reason foretells, the short experience of a few months already confirms. And all this you sanction when you leave the freedman despoiled of his rights.

But the freedman, though forbearing and slow to anger, will not submit to outrage always. He will resist. Resistance will be organized. And here will begin the terrible war of races, foreseen by Jefferson, where God, in all his attributes, has none which can take part with the oppressor. The tragedy of St. Domingo will be renewed on a wider theatre with bloodier incidents. Be warned, I entreat you, by this historic example. It was the denial of rights to colored people, after successive promises, which caused that fearful insurrection. After various vicissitudes, during which the rights of citizenship were conferred on free people of color and then resumed, the slaves at last rose, and here the soul sickens at the recital. Then came Toussaint l'Overture, a black of unmixed blood, who placed himself at the head of his race, showing the genius of war and the genius of statesmanship also. Under his magnanimous rule, the beautiful island began to smile once more; agriculture revived; commerce took a new start; the whites were protected in person and property; and a Constitution was adopted acknowledging the authority of France, but making no distinction on account of color or race. In an evil hour this policy was reversed by a decree of Napoleon Bonaparte. War revived, and the French army was compelled to succumb. The connection of St. Domingo with France was broken, and this island became a Black Republic. All this dreary catalogue of murder, battle, sorrow and woe began in the denial of justice to the colored race. And only recently we have listened to a similar tragedy from Jamaica, thus swelling the terrible testimony. Like causes produce like effects; therefore, all this will be ours if we madly persist in the same denial of justice. The freedmen among us are not unlike the freedmen of St. Domingo or Jamaica; they have the same "organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions," and above all, the same sense of wrong, and the same revenge.

To avoid insurrection and servile war, big with measureless calamity, and even to obtain that security which is essential to industry, agriculture, commerce and the national credit, you must perform the promises of the Republic, originally made by our fathers, and recently renewed by ourselves. But duty done will not only save you from calamity, and give you security; it will also prepare the way for all the triumphs of the future, when through assured peace there shall be tranquillity, prosperity and reconciliation, all of which it is vain to expect without justice.

The freedman must be protected. To this you are specially pledged by the Proclamation of President Lincoln, which, after declaring him "free," promises to *maintain* this freedom, not for any limited period, but for all time. But this cannot be done so long as you deny him the shield of *impartial laws*. Let him be heard in court and let him vote. Let these rights be guarded sacredly. Beyond even the shield of *impartial laws*, he will then have that protection which comes from the consciousness of manhood. Clad in the full panoply of citizenship he will feel at last that he is a man. At present he is only a recent chattel, awaiting your justice to be transmuted into manhood. If you would have him respected in his rights, you must begin by respecting him in your laws. If you would maintain him in his freedom, you must begin by maintaining him in the Equal Rights of citizenship.

And now the national safety is staked on this act of justice. You cannot sacrifice the freedmen without endangering the peace of the country and the stability of our institutions. Everything will be kept in jeopardy. The national credit will suffer. Business of all kinds will feel the insecurity. The whole land will gap with volcanic fire, ready to burst forth in a fatal flood. The irrepressible conflict will be prolonged. The house will continue divided against itself. From all these things, Good Lord, deliver us! But, under God, there is but one deliverance, and this is through justice.

I have said that the national credit will suffer; but this does not disclose the whole financial calamity. It is idle to suppose that recent rebels, restored to the privileges of citizenship, will give their votes cordially for that national debt which has been incurred in the suppression of their rebellion, or that they will willingly tax themselves for the interest on those enormous outlays by which their darling slavery has been overthrown. The evidence shows that they are already set against any such contribution. As time advances, and their power is assured, in conjunction with Northern sympathizers, they will openly oppose it; or if they consent to recognize it, they will impose the condition that the rebel debt shall be recognized also. All this is inevitable if you give them the power; it is madness to tempt them. But they will not have the power if the promises to the freedman are performed. Here again justice to the freedman becomes a necessity.

It is sometimes said that we must not require justice to the freedman in the rebel States, because justice is still denied to the colored citizen in Connecticut and New York. Idle words of inconceivable utterance; as if the two cases bore any imaginable resemblance. There are rivers in the North and rivers in the South, but who says that on this account the two regions are alike? The denial of justice to the colored citizen in Connecticut and New York is wrong and mean; but it is on so small a scale that it is not perilous to the Republic, nor is it vital to the protection of the colored citizen, and the protection of the national creditor. You are moved to enfranchisement in Connecticut and New York simply in order to do justice to a few individuals; but you are moved to it in the rebel States in order to do justice to multitudes, also to save the Republic, which is imperilled by injustice on such a gigantic scale, and to supply needful protection to the national freedman and the national creditor. From failure on our part there is in one case little more than shame, while in the other case there is positive danger to the Republic involving the fate of the national freedman and the national creditor, to whom we are bound by the most solemn ties. To a good man injustice, even on a small scale, cannot be tolerable. He will feel the necessity of resisting it; but where the victims are counted by millions, the necessity becomes a transcendent duty, quickened and invigorated by all the instincts of self-preservation. Therefore, again, I say, for the national safety, do not fail to keep these promises.

It is sometimes said that the Constitution of the United States expressly reserves to the States the power of determining who shall vote, because it declares that "The electors in each State shall have the *qualifications* requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature." But this assumption proceeds on the fatal error that at any time under the Constitution, which makes no distinction of color, there can be any such oligarchical distinction as a "qualification for electors, founded on color." But even assuming that this might be done in a period of peace, yet, beyond all doubt, at the present moment, from the necessity of the case—from the Rights of War—from the Constitutional clause of guarantee—and from the Constitutional Amendment, Congress, by its quadruple powers, is completely authorized to do all that it thinks best for the national security and the national faith in the rebel States. As well question Farragut in the main-top of his steamer—Sherman in his march across Georgia—or Grant in the field before Richmond, as question the authority of Congress on this occasion. But if the authority exists it must be exercised.

GUARANTEE OF A REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

II. And this brings me to the next form of this necessity and duty, as they appear in the guarantee clause of the Constitution. It is expressly declared that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government." These words, when properly understood, leave no alternative. They speak to us with no uncertain voice.

The magnitude of the question now before us may be seen in the postulate with which I begin. Assuming that there has been a lapse of government in any State, so as to impose upon the United States the duty of executing this guarantee, then do I insist that it is the bounden duty of the United Sattes to see that such State has a "republican government," and, in the discharge of this bounden duty, they must declare that a State, which, in the foundation of its government, sets aside "the consent of the governed"—which imposes taxation without representation—which discards the principle of Equal Rights, and which lodges power exclusively with an Oligarchy, Aristocracy, Caste or Monopoly cannot be recognized as a "republican government," according to the requirement of American Institutions. Even if it may satisfy some definition, handed down from antiquity or invented in monarchical Europe, it cannot satisfy the solemn injunction of our Constitution. For this question I now ask a hearing. Nothing in the present debate can equal it in importance. Its correct determination will be an epoch for our country and for mankind.

Believe me, sir, this is no question of theory or abstraction. It is a practical question which you are summoned to decide. Here is the positive text of the Constitution, and you must now affix its meaning. You cannot evade it; you cannot forget it without an abandonment of duty. Others in vision or aspiration have dwelt on the idea of a Republic, and they have been lifted in soul. You must consider it, not merely in vision or aspiration, but practically as legislators, in order to settle its precise definition, to the end that the Constitutional "guarantee" may be performed. Your powers and duties are involved in this definition. The character of the government founded by our fathers is also involved in it. There is another consideration which must not be forgotten. In affixing the proper meaning to this text, and determining what is a "republican government," you act as a court in the last resort from which there is no appeal. You are the sole and exclusive judges. You may decide as you please. Rarely in history has such an opportunity been offered to the statesman. You may raise the name of Republic to majestic heights of justice and truth, or you may let it drag low down in the depths of wrong and falsehood. You may make it fulfil the idea of John Milton, when he said that "a commonwealth ought to be but as one huge Christian personage, one mighty growth or stature of an honest man, as big and compact in virtue as in body;" or you may let it shrink into the ignoble form of a pretender, with the name of Republic, but without its soul.

[Mr. Sumner then considers the origin of this guarantee, and how it obtained a place in the Constitution. The want of such a provision was felt as a capital defect in the Confederation. In the Convention it was proposed by Randolph of Virginia, advocated by Mason of the same State, and after some change of phraseology was unanimously adopted as it now stands. A further reason was suggested in the *Federalist*, No. XXI., that experiments in governments of other forms might at some time be attempted by ambitious leaders in the several States.]

The very crisis herein anticipated has arrived. "The caprice of particular States" and "the ambition of enterprising leaders" have done their worst. And now the "guarantee" must be performed, not only for the sake of individual States, but for the sake of the Union to which they all belong, and to advance the declared objects of the Constitution, specified in its preamble.

The text of this great undertaking is worthy of study. No stronger or more comprehensive words could be employed, whether we regard the object, the party guaranteeing, or the party guaranteed. The express object is "a republican form of government." This is plain enough. The party guaranteeing is not merely the Executive or some specified branch of the National Government, but "the United States," or, in other words, the Nation. The Republic, which is the impersonation of all, guarantees "a republican form of government," and every branch of the National Government must sustain the "guarantee," including especially Congress, which is the collected will of the people. The obligation is not less broad when we consider the party guaranteed. Here there can be no evasion. The "guarantee" is not merely for the advantage of individual States, but for the common defence and the general welfare. It is a "guarantee" to each in the interest of all, and, therefore, a "guarantee" to all. And such is the solidarity of States in the Union, that the good of all is involved in the good of each. For each and all, then, this "guarantee" must be performed when the *casus foederis* arrives. As a guarantor, the Republic, according to a familiar principle, is called to act only on the default of the party guaranteed; but when the default has occurred, then the duty is fixed in all its amplitude.

[The question is then considered, what is a republican government? It is necessary to attach a precise signification to the term, for, properly interpreted, it becomes at once a support of Human Rights and a balance-wheel to our whole political system. A large number of definitions are stated in order to be put aside.]

TRUE SOURCE OF DEFINITION.

Every constitution embodies the principles of its framers. It is a transcript of their minds. If its meaning in any place is open to doubt, or if words are used which seem to have no fixed signification, we cannot err if we turn to the framers; and their authority increases in proportion to the evidence which they have left on the question. By a "republican form of government," our fathers plainly intended that government which embodied the principles for which they had struggled. Now, if it appears that through years of controversy they had insisted on certain principles as vital to free government, even to the extent of encountering the mother country in war; that afterward, on solemn occasions, they had heralded these principles to the world as "self-evident truths;" that also, in declared opinions, they had sustained these principles, and that, in public acts, they had embodied these principles—then is it beyond dispute that these principles must have entered into the idea of that government which they took pains to place under the "guarantee" of the United States. But all these things can be shown unanswerably.

In these words of hypothesis, I have already foreshadowed the four different heads under which these principles may be seen: first, as asserted by the fathers throughout the long revolutionary controversy which culminated in war; secondly, as announced in solemn declarations; thirdly, as sustained in declared opinions; and fourthly, as embodied in public acts.

[Under these four heads, numerous authorities are collected, and the doctrines of James Otis, of Franklin, of the Legislature of Virginia and of Pennsylvania, and of the Congress of 1765, are stated at length. The political history of America during the twelve years preceding the Declaration, tended steadily toward a republic with Liberty and Equality as its animating principles, "where the Government should rest on consent of the governed, or, which is the same thing, where there should be no taxation without representation." After the Declaration of Independence, the same principles were reiterated. The Declaration itself embodied them. The opinions of the fathers, of Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, of the Adamses, of Roger Sherman, of Pinckney and Mason, down to Webster, breathe the same spirit. "Thus at every stage, from the opening, when Otis announced that 'taxation without representation is tyranny,' to Daniel Webster, we find 'representation' an essential element in the American definition of a republican government." The public acts which testify to the true character of republican government are of two classes; those of the United States, and those by the States individually.]

Looking at the States, in their collective character, we shall find that at the adoption of the National Constitution, they had refused to recognize any exclusion from the elective franchise on account of color and race. The fathers knew too well the requirements of a republican government to sanction any such exclusion. Recognizing slavery as a transitory condition which would soon cease, they threw over it a careful oblivion; but they were none the less jealous of the rights of all freemen. "*The slave did not pay taxes*, and so far as he was a person and not property, he was a part of the family of his master, by whom he was represented, so that the commanding principle of the Revolution was not disturbed in his case. But, on becoming a freeman, the slave stepped at once within the pale of taxation, and, therefore, necessarily of representation, since the two were inseparable. And this consideration was the guide to our fathers.

[The Congress of the Confederation refused point-blank to insert the word "white" in the articles of Confederation. In the territorial acts of 1784 and the famous Ordinance of 1787, the idea of color was excluded, and they were followed in this by the successive acts of Congress. Nor was this rule changed till the fathers of the Revolution and authors of the Constitution had disappeared from the scene. The policy of the separate States in the same direction is traced at length, and the conclusion is thus given:]

AMERICAN DEFINITION OF A REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT.

And here I bring this part of the argument to a close. We have seen the origin of the controversy which led to the Revolution, when Otis, with such wise hardihood, insisted upon Equal Rights, and then, giving practical effect to the lofty demand, sounded the battle-cry that "Taxation without Representation is Tyranny." We have followed this controversy in its anxious stages, where these principles were constantly asserted and constantly denied, until it broke forth in battle; we have seen these principles adopted as the very frontlet of the Republic when it assumed its place in the family of nations, and then again when it ordained its Constitution; we have seen them avowed and illustrated in memorable words by the greatest authorities of the time; lastly, we have seen them embodied in public acts of the States collectively and individually; and now, out of this concurring, cumulative and unimpeachable testimony, constituting a speaking aggregation absolutely without precedent, I offer you the American definition of a Republican form of government. It is in vain that you cite philosophers or publicists, or the examples of former history. Against these I put the early and constant postulates of the fathers, the corporate declarations of the fathers, the avowed opinions of the fathers, and the public acts of the fathers, all with one voice proclaiming—first, that all men are Equal in rights; and secondly, that here is the American idea of a Republic, which must be adopted in the interpretation of the National Constitution. You can not reject it. As well reject the Decalogue in determining moral duties, or as well reject the multiplication table in determining a question of arithmetic.

Counter to this irresistible conclusion, there can be only one suggestion having any seeming plausibility, and this is founded on the contemporary recognition of slavery. On this point it is enough if I remind you, first, that our fathers did not recognize slavery as a permanent part of our system, but treated it as exceptional and transitory, while they concealed it from view by words which might mean something else; secondly, that the slave was always regarded, legally and politically, as a part of the family of his master, according to the nomenclature of Blackstone's Commentaries, which were much read at the time, where master and servant were grouped with husband and wife, parent and child, and, as in the case of wife and child, *the slave was represented by the head of the family, who also paid the taxes on his account*, so that, in his case, the cardinal principle of the Revolution, associating representation and taxation together, was not in any respect violated; and thirdly, that by the acts of the Continental Congress, and by all the State Constitutions, except that of South Carolina, all distinction of color was discarded in determining the elective franchise, and that one of the authorized expounders of the National Constitution at the time, Alexander Hamilton, announced in the *Federalist*, as if anticipating the very question now before us, IF THE LAWS WERE TO RESTORE THE RIGHTS WHICH HAVE BEEN TAKEN AWAY, THE NEGROES COULD NO LONGER BE REFUSED AN EQUAL SHARE OF REPRESENTATION WITH OTHER INHABITANTS. Such was the understanding, and such was the promise at the adoption of the Constitution. Such was the declared meaning of our fathers, according to the contemporary testimony of Alexander Hamilton. Therefore, while confessing sorrowfully their inconsistency in recognizing Slavery, and throwing over their shame the mantle which the son of Noah threw over his father, we must reject every argument or inference on this account against the true idea of a Republic, which is none other than where all the citizens have an *equal voice* in the government. As Washington, by his august example, gave to mankind a new idea of political greatness, so did the fathers, by their great example, give to mankind a new idea of government. Do you ask again for authority? I offer it to you. It is in the early dictionary of James Otis, Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, and Benjamin Franklin. It is in the Lexicon of the revolution. It is in the Thesaurus of our national history. It is in the Collection of Public acts. This new idea was the great discovery of our fathers. Rob them of this, and you take from them their highest title to gratitude. Columbus, venturing into an unknown sea, discovered a New World of space; but our fathers, venturing likewise, discovered a New World of public duty. It is for us, their children, not to forget their discovery.

[Some recent European definitions are then briefly stated, including the proclamation of universal suffrage by the Provincial Government, and the declarations of M. Garnier Pages, Richard Price, and Immanuel Kant. The remainder of the speech we give in full.]

REBEL STATES ARE NOT REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENTS.

Such is the definition of a republican form of government. It remains now that we should bring these lapsed States to this standard and see their small title to recognition. Authentic figures are not wanting. The census of 1860 discloses the population of these States in question. Here is the table:

States.	White population.	Colored population, Slave and Free, including Indians.
Alabama	526,271	436,930
Arkansas	324,243	111,307
Florida	77,747	62,677
Georgia	591,550	465,736
Louisiana	357,456	350,546
Mississippi	353,901	437,404
North Carolina	629,942	362,680
South Carolina	291,300	412,408
Tennessee	826,722	288,079
Texas	420,891	183,324
Virginia	1,047,299	549,019
Total	5,447,222	3,666,110

A glance at this table is enough. Taking the sum total of the population in the eleven States, we find 5,447,222 whites to 3,666,110 colored persons; and you are now to decide, whether in the discharge of your duties under the Constitution, and bound to guarantee a republican form of government, you will disfranchise this mighty mass, shutting them out from those Equal Rights promised by our fathers, and from all voice in the government of their country. They surpass in numbers, by at least a million, the whole population of the colonies at the time our fathers raised the cry, "Taxation without Representation is Tyranny;" and now you are to decide whether you will despoil them of representation while you subject them to a grinding taxation by tariff and excise, acting directly and indirectly, which dwarfs into insignificance everything attempted by the British Parliament. Our fathers could not bear a stamp act, in the making of which they had no voice, and they went forth to battle with the most formidable power of the globe rather than pay a tax of three pence on tea imposed by a Parliament in which they were not represented. Are you ready, sir, in disregard of this great precedent, and in disregard also of all the promises and examples of our past history, to thrust a single citizen out of all representation in the government while you consume his substance with taxation, subject him to stamp acts, compel him to pay a duty of twenty-five cents a pound on tea, and then follow him with your imposts in all the business of life? Clearly, if you do not recognize his title to representation, you must at least by careful legislation relieve him from this intolerable taxation. Some of these millions, whom you thrust out, already contribute largely to the public revenue. How then can you deny them representation? Their money is not rejected. Why reject their votes? But if you reject their votes, you cannot take their money. As you can detect no color in their money, you ought to detect no color in their votes.

If looking at these States together the duty of Congress seems clear, it becomes clearer even when we look at them separately. Begin with Tennessee, which disfranchises 288,079 citizens, being more than a quarter of its whole population. Thus violating a distinctive principle of republican government, how can this State be recognized as republican? This question is easier asked than answered. But Tennessee is the least offensive on the list. There is Virginia, which disfranchises 549,019 citizens, being more than a third of its whole population. There is Alabama, which disfranchises 436,930 citizens, being nearly one-half of its whole population. There is Mississippi, which disfranchises 437,404 citizens, being much more than one-half of its whole population. And there is South Carolina, which disfranchises 412,408 citizens, being nearly two-thirds of its whole population. A republic is a pyramid standing on the broad mass of the people as a base; but here is a pyramid balanced on its point. To call such a government "republican" is a mockery of sense and decency. A monarch, "surrounded by republican institutions," would be less offensive to correct principles, and give more security to Human Rights.

It is not difficult to classify these States. They are aristocracies or oligarchies. An aristocracy, according to the etymology of the world, is the government of the best. An oligarchy is the government of the few, and is not even an aristocracy, but an abuse of aristocracy as despotism is the abuse of monarchy. Perhaps these States may be characterized in either way; and yet the term aristocracy, especially in its origin, has something respectable, which cannot be attributed to a combination whose single distinctive element is the color of the skin.

The eminent publicist, Bodin, in his definition of an aristocracy, says that it exists *where a smaller body of citizens governs the greater*, and this definition has been adopted by others, especially by Montesquieu. But this is not satisfactory. Hallam, whose judgment is of the highest value, after discussing the merits of this definition, proposes the following substitute:

"We might better say that the distinguishing characteristic of an *aristocracy* is the enjoyment of privileges, *which are not communicable to other citizens simply by anything they can themselves do to obtain them.*"—*Hallam's Literature of Europe, vol. ii. cap. 4, § 52.*

These words completely characterize the aristocracy of color; for such an aristocracy is plainly in the enjoyment of privileges, which are not communicable to other citizens, by anything they can themselves do to obtain them.

To show that our rebel States are aristocracies or oligarchies is enough for the present occasion. But we must not forget that, born of slavery, they have the spirit of that iniquity, so that they are essentially of a low type. Founded on the color of the skin, they are, beyond all question, the most senseless and disgusting of all history. Would you know to what they might incline? Listen to the frank words of the greatest Venetian writer, the famous Father Paul, while he counsels the privileged class, in a state refined by art and elevated by glory, how to use their powers. "If a noble," says he, "injure a plebeian, justify him by all possible means; but should that be found quite impossible, punish more in appearance than in reality. If a plebeian insult a noble, punish him with the greatest severity, that the commonalty may know how perilous it is to insult a noble." (Sarpi, *Opinione per il perpetuo Dominio di Venezia*, p. 13.) Such is the terrible rule laid down in a document, which taught how to make the power of Venice perpetual. But this same spirit predominates still in the rebel States. It rages there with more revolting cruelty than it ever raged in Venice. And such is the government which now claims recognition as "Republican."

The pretension thus organized is hateful on another ground. It is nothing less than a Caste, which is at once irreligious and unrepublican. A Caste cannot exist except in defiance of the first principles of Christianity and the first principles of a Republic. It is Heathenism in religion and Tyranny in government. The Brahmins and the Sudras in India, from generation to generation, have been separated, as the two races are now separated in these States. If a Sudra presumed to sit on a Brahmin's carpet he was punished with banishment. But our recent rebels undertake to play the part of Brahmins, and exclude citizens, with better title than themselves from essential rights, simply on the ground of Caste, which, according to its Portuguese origin, *casta*, is only another term for race.

But this pretension is in yet other respects hostile to good government. It is essentially a Monopoly in a country which sets its face against all monopolies as unequal and immoral. If any monopoly deserves unhesitating judgment, it must be that which absorbs the rights of others and engrosses political power. How vain it is to condemn the petty monopolies of commerce and then allow this vast, all-embracing monopoly of Human Rights.

Clearly, most clearly, and beyond all question, such a government cannot be considered "Republican in form." Call it an Oligarchy, call it an Aristocracy, call it a Caste, call it a Monopoly; but do not call it a Republic.

DUTY OF CONGRESS.

Of course such a government can exist only in defiance of the Constitution, and it is the duty of Congress to interfere against it. President Johnson, in his annual message, says: "In case of the usurpation of the government of a State by one man or an *Oligarchy*, it becomes a duty of the United States to make good the guarantee to that State of a republican form of government." The President forgets to mention an Aristocracy, and does not add, what is true, that the authority which must make good the guarantee is the sole judge of the exigency. To this end everything centres in Congress, whose powers are commensurate with the occasion. In aid of the "guarantee" clause are those other words in the Constitution, providing that Congress "shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested in the Government of the United States." Under this ample provision, there is a duty to be performed, by any means which may seem best. The jurisdiction is complete and it is in Congress. If any authority for this proposition were needed it would be found in the words of Chief-Justice Taney, speaking for the Supreme Court of the United States.

"The fourth section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States provides that the United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and, on the application of the Legislature or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.

"*Under this article of the Constitution, it rests with Congress to decide what government is the established one in a State. For, as the United States guarantee to each State a republican government, Congress must necessarily decide what government is established in the State before it can determine whether it is republican or not.*"—*7 Howard Rep., 42, Luther v. Borden.*

In the exercise of this power two courses are open. One is to impose an irrepealable condition upon the unrepublican States, requiring them, before recognition, to reform their governments to the satisfaction of Congress. The other, and more direct course, is by Act of Congress, in performance of the "guarantee," and according to the plenary authority "for carrying into execution the powers vested in the Government of the United States," to provide all needful safeguards, and especially to place the Equal Rights of all under the guardianship of National Law.

Against the exercise of this power there are but two arguments: first, that the Constitution, by providing that "the electors in each State shall have the *qualifications* requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature," has reserved to each State the power of excluding citizens merely on account of color, even though constituting more than a majority of the population. The other argument is that, since certain States at the North have disfranchised the few colored persons within their borders, the United States are so far constrained by this example that they cannot protect the millions of freedmen in the Rebel States from disfranchisement, and cannot save the Republic from the peril of such a prodigious injustice. I know not which of these two arguments is the least reasonable, or rather, which is the most reprehensible. They are both unreasonable and both reprehensible. They both do violence to the true principles of the Constitution, if not to common sense.

It is true that, according to the text of the Constitution, each State may determine the "qualifications" of electors, but this can have no application to an exigency like the present, where, at the close of a prolonged and desperate rebellion, the United States are obliged to guarantee to certain States a republican form of government. In the performance of this "guarantee," the United States can look only at the essential elements of such a government; nor more nor less; without regard to State laws. But, I am not willing to rest the argument here. Even assuming that there has been no lapse of State governments, so as to bring the "guarantee" into operation—assuming that we are in a condition of assured peace—then I utterly deny that the power to determine the "qualifications" of electors can give any power to disfranchise actual citizens. It is "qualifications" only which the State can determine, meaning, by this limited term, those requirements of personal condition which are regarded as essential to the security of the franchise. These "qualifications" cannot be in their nature permanent or insurmountable. Color cannot be a "qualification," any more than size or the quality of the hair. A permanent or insurmountable "qualification" is equal to a deprivation of the suffrage—in other words, it is the tyranny of taxation without representation, and this tyranny, I insist, is not intrusted to any State of the Union. This is the very ground taken by Mr. Madison, when, defending the National Constitution in the Virginia Constitution, he said:

"Some States might regulate the elections on the principle of *Equality*, and others might regulate them otherwise. * * Should the people of any State, by any means, be deprived of the right of suffrage, *it was judged proper that it should be remedied by the General Government.* * * If the elections be regulated properly by the State Legislature, the Congressional control will very probably never be exercised. This power appears to be satisfactory, and unlikely to be abused as any part of the Constitution."—*Elliot's Debates, vol. iii. p. 347.*

With these decisive words from one of the chief framers of the Constitution, backed by the reason of the case, I dismiss this objection to the little consideration it deserves. And I dismiss to the same indifference that other objection, that our hands are tied because certain Northern States have done a wrong and mean thing. Pray, sir, how can the failure of these States affect the power of Congress in a great exigency

ers of Congress under the Constitutional Amendment. You cannot deny this principle without setting aside those most remarkable judgments which stand as landmarks of our Constitutional history. But who can doubt that the abolition of the whole Black Code, in all its oligarchical pretensions, civil and political, is "appropriate" to "enforce" the abolition of slavery? Mark, if you please, the language of this grant. Congress may "enforce" abolition, and nobody can question the "means" which it thinks best to employ. Let it not hesitate to adopt the "means" which promises to be the most affective. As the occasion is extraordinary, so the "means" employed must be extraordinary.

But the Senate has already by solemn vote asserted this very jurisdiction. You have, sir, decreed that colored persons shall enjoy the same civil rights as white persons; in other words, that, with regard to civil rights, there shall be no Oligarchy, Aristocracy, Caste or Monopoly, but that all shall be equal before the law without distinction of color. And this great decree you have made as "appropriate legislation" under the Constitutional Amendment "to enforce the abolition of slavery." Surely you have not erred in this act. Beyond all question, the protection of colored persons in civil rights is essential to complete the abolition of slavery; but the protection of colored persons in political rights is not less essential; and the power is as ample in one case as in the other. In each case you legislate for the maintenance of colored persons in that Liberty which has been so tardily accorded, and the legislation is just as "appropriate" in one case as in the other. The protection of colored persons in their civil rights by Act of Congress will be a great event. It will be great in itself. It will be greater still, because it establishes the power of Congress, without any further amendment of the Constitution, to protect colored persons in all their rights, including of course the elective franchise. There are precedents of Congress, as well as of courts, which are landmarks; and this is one of them.

Therefore, as authority for Congress, you have two sources in the Constitution itself: first, the guarantee clause, and, secondly, the Constitutional Amendment; each sufficient—the two together of two-fold sufficiency. To establish the Equal Rights of all, no further amendment is needed. The actual text is exuberant. Instead of adding new words, it will be enough if you give to those which exist the natural force which belongs to them. Instead of neglecting them, use them. Instead of supplementing them, interpret them. An illustrious magistrate once retorted upon an advocate, who, dissatisfied with a ruling of the court, threatened to burn his books, "you had better read them;" and so would I say now to all who think the Constitution needs amendment, you had better read it. Yes, sir, read it in the principles proclaimed by the fathers before the Revolution; read it in the declarations of the fathers when they took their place as a republic; read it in the avowed opinions of the fathers; read it in the Public Acts of the fathers; and in all this beaming light you will discern its true meaning. Then again read it in that other light which, as from another sun, newly risen at mid-day, streams from the obligation of Congress to "enforce" the abolition of slavery. And then again read it in the glowing illumination of the war. But, in whichever light you read it, you will find always the same irresistible meaning. Even if the text were doubtful, the war makes it clear. The victory which overthrew slavery has carried with it all the glosses and constructions by which this wrong was originally fastened upon the Constitution. For generations the Constitution has been interpreted for slavery. From this time forward it must be interpreted in harmony with the Declaration of Independence, so that Human Rights shall always prevail. The promises of the fathers must be sacredly fulfilled. This is the commanding rule, superseding all other rules. This is one of the great victories of the war—perhaps the greatest. It is nothing less than the Emancipation of the Constitution itself.

THE BALLOT, THE ONLY SUFFICIENT GUARANTEE.

Mr. President such is the testimony of history, authority, and Constitution, which binds the judgment on this occasion, leaving no alternative. Thus far, I have done little but bring the diversified testimony together and weave it into one body. It is not I who speak. I am nothing. It is the cause, whose voice I am, which speaks to you. But there are yet other things which, even at this late hour, crave to be said. And here, after this long review, I am brought back to mere general considerations, and end as I began, by showing the necessity of Enfranchisement for the sake of Public Security and Public Faith. I plead now for the ballot, as the Great Guarantee; and *the only sufficient Guarantee*—being in itself peacemaker, reconciler, schoolmaster, and protector—to which we are bound by every necessity and every reason; and I speak, also, for the good of these States, as well as for the glory and safety of the Republic, that it may be an example to mankind.

Let me be understood. What I especially ask is impartial suffrage, which is, of course embraced in universal suffrage, as the greater in the less. What is universal is necessarily impartial. For the present, I simply insist that all shall be equal before the law, so that, in the enjoyment of this right, there shall be no restriction which is not applicable to all. Any further question, in the nature of "qualification," belongs to another stage of the debate. And yet I have no hesitation in saying that universal suffrage is a universal right, subject only to such regulations as the safety of society may require. These may concern (1) age, (2) character, (3) registration, (4) residence. Nobody doubts that minors may be excluded, and so, also, persons of infamous life. Registration and residence are both prudential requirements for the safeguard of the ballot-box against the Nomads and Bohemians of politics, and to compel the exercise of this franchise where a person is known among his neighbors and friends. Education also, may, under certain circumstances, be a requirement of prudence, especially valuable in a republic, where so much depends on the intelligence of the people. These temporary restrictions do not in any way interfere with the right of suffrage, for they leave it *absolutely accessible to all*. Even, if impediments, they are such as may be easily overcome. At all events, they are not in any sense insurmountable, and this is the essential requirement of republican institutions. No matter under what depression of poverty, in what depth of obscurity, or with what diversity of complexion you may have been born, you are, nevertheless, a citizen—the peer of every other citizen, and the ballot is your inalienable right.

The ballot is a *peace-maker*, and, are we not told, Blessed are the peace-makers? High among the Beatitudes let it be placed, for there it belongs. Deny it, and the freedman will be the victim of a perpetual warfare. In ceasing to be a slave he only becomes a sacrifice. Grant it, and he is admitted to those Equal Rights which allow no sacrifice. Plutarch records that the wise man of Athens charmed the people by the saying that *Equality causes no war*, and "both the rich and poor repeated it." And so master and slave will yet enjoy the transforming power of this principle. The master will recognize the new citizen. The slave will stand with tranquil self-respect in the presence of the master. Brute force disappears. Distrust is at an end. The master is no longer a tyrant. The freedman is no longer a dependant. The ballot comes to him in his depression, and says, "use me and be elevated." It comes to him in his passions and says, "use me and do not fight." It comes to him in his daily thoughts, filling him with the strength and glory of manhood.

The ballot is a *reconciler*. Next after peace is reconciliation. But reconciliation is more than peace. It is concord. Parties that have been estranged are brought into harmony. They learn to live together. They learn to work together. They are kind to each other, even if it be only as the Arab and his horse; and this mutual kindness is a mutual advantage. Unquestionably, the ballot promotes this great boon, because it brings all into natural relations of justice, without which reconciliation is a vain thing. Do you wish to see harmony truly prevail, so that industry, society, government, civilization, may all prosper, and the Republic may wear a crown of true greatness? Then do not neglect the ballot.

The ballot is a *schoolmaster*. Reading and writing are of inestimable value, but the ballot teaches what these cannot teach. It teaches manhood. Especially is it important to a race whose manhood has been denied. The work of redemption cannot be complete if the ballot is left in doubt. The freedman already knows his friends by the unerring instinct of the heart. Give him the ballot and he will be educated into the principles of government. Deny him the ballot and he will continue an alien in knowledge as in rights. His claim is exceptional, as your injustice is exceptional. For generations you have shut him out from all education, making it a crime to teach him to read for himself the Book of Life. Let not the tyranny of the past be an apology for any further exclusion. Prisoners for a long time immured in dungeons are sometimes blinded as they come forth into the light of day; but this is no reason for continued imprisonment. To every freedman the ballot is the light of day.

The ballot is a *protector*. Perhaps, at the present moment, this is its highest function. Slavery has ceased in name; but this is all. The old masters still assert an inhuman power, and now by positive statutes seek to bind the freedman in new chains. Let this conspiracy proceed unchecked and the freedman will be more unhappy than the early Puritan, who, seeking liberty of conscience, escaped from the "lords bishops" only to fall under the "lords elders." The master will still be master under another name, as according to Milton.

"New presbyter is but old priest writ large."

Serfdom or apprenticeship is slavery in another guise. To save the freedman from this tyranny, with all its accumulated outrage, is your solemn duty. For this we are now devising guarantees; but, believe me, the only sufficient guarantee is the ballot. Let the freedman vote, and he will have in himself under the law a constant, ever-present, self-protecting power. The armor of citizenship will be his best security. The ballot will be to him sword and buckler—a sword with which to pierce his enemies, and a buckler on which to receive their assault. Its possession alone will be a terror and a defence. The law, which is the highest reason, boasts that every man's house is his castle; but the freedman can have no castle without the ballot. When the master knows that he may be voted down he will know that he must be just, and everything is contained in justice. The ballot is the one thing needful, without which rights of testimony and all other rights will be no better than cobwebs which the master will break through with impunity. To him who has the ballot all other things shall be given—protection, opportunity, education, a homestead. The ballot is like the Horn of Abundance, out of which overflow rights of every kind, with corn, cotton, rice, and all the fruits of the earth. Or better still, it is like the hand of the body, without which man, who is now only a little lower than the angels, must have continued only a little above the brutes. We are fearfully and wonderfully made; but, as is the hand in the work of civilization, so is the ballot in the work of government. "Give me the ballot and I can move the world," may be the exclamation of the race still dispoiled of this right. There is nothing which it cannot open with almost fabulous power, like that golden mistletoe, offshoot of the sturdy oak, which in the hands of the classical adventurer, unclosed the regions of another world, and like that golden bough, it is renewed as it is used.

"One plucked away, a second branch you see
Shoot forth in gold, and glitter from the tree."

If I press these illustrations, it is only that I may bring home to your minds that supreme efficacy, which cannot be exaggerated. Though simple in character, there is nothing the ballot cannot accomplish; like that homely household lamp in Arabian story, which, at the call of its possessor, evoked a spirit who did all things from the building of a palace to the rocking of a cradle, and filled the air with an invisible presence. But it is as a protector that it is of immeasurable power—like a 15-inch Columbiad pointed from a Monitor. Aye, sir, the ballot is the Columbiad of our political life, and every citizen who has it is a full-armed Monitor.

Having pleaded for the freedman, I now plead for the Republic, for to each alike the ballot is a *necessity*. It is idle to expect any true peace while the freedman is robbed of this transcendent right, and left a prey to that vengeance which is ready to wreak upon him the disappointment of defeat. The country, sympathetic with him, will be in a condition of perpetual unrest. With him it will suffer, and with him alone can it cease to suffer. Only through him can you redress the balance of our political system, and assure the safety of patriot citizens. Only through him can you save the national debt from the inevitable repudiation which awaits it when recent rebels, in conjunction with Northern allies, once more bear sway. He is our best guarantee. Use him. He was once your fellow-soldier; he has always been your fellow-man. If he is willing to die for the Republic, he is surely good enough to vote. And now that he is ready to uphold the Republic, it will be madness to reject him. Had he voted originally, the acts of Secession must have failed. Treason would have been voted down. You owe this tragical war and the debt now fastened upon the country to the denial of this right. Vacant chairs in once happy homes, innumerable graves, saddened hearts, mothers, fathers, wives, sisters brothers, all mourning lost ones, the poor now ground by a taxation they had never known before, all testify against that injustice by which the present freedman was not allowed to vote. Had he voted there would have been peace. If he votes now there will be peace. Without this you must have a standing army, which is a sorry substitute for justice. Before you is the plain alternative of the ballot-box or the cartridge-box; choose ye between them.

Reason, too, in every way and with every voice, cries out in unison with necessity. All policies, all expediencies, all economies take up the cry. Nothing so impolitic as wrong; nothing so inexpedient as tyranny; nothing so little economical as the spirit of Caste. Justice is the highest policy, the truest expediency, and the most comprehensive economy. In this inspiration act. Do you wish to save the national credit, now imperilled by fatal injustice, and especially to secure gold as the national currency? Then do not let the question of Equal Rights disturb the country with its volcanic throes. You complain that labor is unorganized, and that the cotton crop has failed. Do you wish labor to smile and cotton to grow? Then sow the land with human rights, and encircle it round about with justice. The freedman will not, cannot work, while you deny his rights. Cotton will not, cannot grow in such an atmosphere. It is absurd to expect it. In using the freedman as you now do, you imitate those barbarous Irish who insisted upon plowing by the horse's tail, until an Act of Parliament interfered to require plowing by harness. The infinite folly must be corrected among us, if for no higher reason than because it is unprofitable. But it is contrary to nature, and on this account renders the whole social system insecure. Where human rights are set at naught, there can be no tranquillity except that of force, which is despotism. This most reasonable conclusion is sustained by the philosophy of history, which, speaking by one of its oracles, the great Italian Vico, tells us most sententiously that "nothing out of its natural state can either easily subsist or last long." Truer words were never uttered as a statement of philosophy or a warning to injustice enacted into law.

GOOD AND GLORY OF THE REPUBLIC.

Mr. President, already I have taken too much time, and still the great theme, in its various and multitudinous relations, continues to open before us. At each step it rises in some new aspect—assuming every form of interest and of duty—now with voice of command, and then with voice of persuasion. The national security, the national faith, the good of the freedman, the concerns of business, agriculture, justice, peace, reconciliation, obedience to God—such are some of the forms it takes. In the name of all these I speak to-day, hoping to do something for my country, and especially for that unhappy portion which has been arrayed in arms against us. The people there are our fellow-citizens, and gladly would I hail them, if they would permit it, as no longer a "section," no longer "the South," but integral part of the Republic—under a Constitution which knows no North and no South, and cannot tolerate any "sectional" pretensions. Gladly do I offer my best efforts, in all sincerity, for their welfare. But I see clearly that there is nothing in the compass of mortal power so important to them in every respect, morally, politically and economically—that there is nothing with such certain promise to them of beneficent results—that there is nothing so sure to make their land smile with industry and fertility as the decree of Equal Rights which I now invoke. Let the decree go forth to cover them with blessings, sure to descend upon their children in successive generations. They have given us war; we give them peace. They have raged against us in the name of slavery; we send them back the benediction of justice for all. They menace hate; we offer in return all the sacred charities of country, together with oblivion of the past. This is our "Measure for Measure." This is our retaliation. This is our only revenge.

And here I hope to be pardoned if I stop for one moment to express my unfailing confidence in the triumph of the cause. Timid or perverse counsels may postpone the gladsome consummation; but the contest now begun can end only when slavery is completely transformed by a metamorphosis which shall substitute justice for injustice, riches for poverty, and beauty for deformity. From history we learn, not only the past, but the future. By the study of what has been we know what must be, according to unerring law. Call it, if you please, the logic of events, and infer the inevitable conclusion. Or call it, if you please, the Rule of Three, and from the results of certain forces determine the proportionate results of increased forces. There can be no mistake in the answer. And so it is plain that the equal rights of all will be established. Amid all seeming vicissitudes the work goes on. Soon or late the final victory will be won. I believe soon. Speeches cannot stop it; crafty machinations cannot change it. Against its irresistible movement politicians are as impotent as those old conjurors, who imagined that

"By rhymes they could pull down full soon,
From lofty sky the wading moon."

These verses, which shine on the black-letter page of the great lawyer, Sir Edward Coke, aptly describe the incantations of our day to pull down Justice from her lofty sky. It cannot be done. In this conviction I can observe what comes to pass without losing faith. I can listen with composure to arguments which ought not to be made, and I can see with equal composure how individual opinions hesitate between Congress and the President. It is not to the oscillations of the pendulum that we look for the measure of time, but to the face of the public clock and the striking of the church bell. The indications of that clock and the striking of that bell leave no room for doubt.

In the fearful tragedy now drawing to a close, there is a destiny, stern and irresistible as that of the Greek Drama, which seems to master all that is done, hurrying on the death of slavery and its whole brood of sin. There is also a Christian Providence, which watches this battle for right, caring especially for the poor and downtrodden who have no helper. The freedman, still writhing under cruel oppression, now lifts his voice to God the avenger. It is for us to save ourselves from righteous judgment. Never with impunity can you outrage human nature. Our country, which is guilty still, is paying still the grievous penalty. Therefore, by every motive of self-preservation we are summoned to be just. And thus is the cause associated indissolubly with the national life.

But in saving the Republic we elevate it. In overthrowing an oppressive injustice we give full scope to the principles of our Government and fulfil that "Idea of a perfect Commonwealth," which has entered into the visions of philosophy and poetry. "I am all that has been, that is and that shall be, and none among mortals has hitherto lifted my veil;" such was the enigma cut on the pavement of the temple of Minerva. For ages it remained unanswered; but the answer is now at hand. The Republic is all that has been, that is and that shall be; and it is pour duty to lift the vail. To do less than this were a failure, for such was the aspiration and promise of our fathers when they assumed their first vows in the family of nations. To do this will fix the example of American Institutions. So long as slavery endured, it was impossible; so long as a Black Code, the wretched counterpart of slavery, endures in any form, it is impossible. To attain this idea we must proclaim the rule of Justice. Slavery thus far has been the very pivot round which the Republic has revolved, while all its policy at home and abroad has radiated from this terrible centre. Hereafter the Equal Rights of All will take the place of slavery, and the Republic will revolve on this glorious pivot, whose infinite, far-reaching radiations will be the happiness of the Human Family. There is nothing that the imagination can picture which will not be ours. Where justice is supreme nothing can be wanting. There will be room for every business and for every charity. The fields will nod with increase; industry will be quickened to imagined success, and life itself will be raised to a higher service. There will be that repose which comes from harmony, and also that simplicity which comes from one prevailing law, both of which are essential to the idea of the Republic. Our country will cease to be a pathwork where different States vary in the rights they accord, and will become a Plural Unit with one Constitution, one Liberty, and one Universal Franchise. With all these things the Republic will be a synonym for justice and peace, for these will be inseparable from its name. In our longings we need not repair to philosophy or poetry. Nor need we go back to the memorable sage, who declared that the best government was where every citizen rushed to the defence of the humblest, as if he were the State, for all this will be ours. Nor need we go back to that patriot king, in ancient tragedy, who, inspired by the Republican idea, exclaimed:

"——The people I made supreme,
And on this city *with an equal right*
For all to vote, its freedom have bestowed."

Here at last, among us, all this will be assured, and the Republic will be of such renown and virtue that all at home or abroad who bear the American name may exclaim with more than Roman pride, "I am an American citizen;" and if danger approaches, they may repeat the same cry with more than Roman confidence, knowing well that this title will be a sufficient protection.

EQUAL RIGHTS OF ALL.

Sir, it is for you now to determine if all this shall be fulfilled. The whole case is before you in its grandeur and in its humanity, infinite as human aspirations, beautiful as the vision of a Republic. Do not turn away from it. Vindicate the great cause, I entreat you, by the suppression of all oligarchical pretensions and the establishment of those Equal Rights without which republican government is a name only, and nothing more. Strike at the Black Code as you have already struck at the Slave Code. There is nothing to choose between them. Strike at once; strike hard. You have already proclaimed Emancipation; proclaim Enfranchisement also. And do not stultify yourselves by setting at naught the practical principle of the fathers, that all just government stands only on the consent of the governed, and its inseparable corollary, that *taxation without representation is tyranny*. What was once true is true forever, although we may for a time lose sight of it, and this is the case with those imperishable truths to which you have been, alas! so indifferent. Thus far the work is only *half done*. See that it is finished. Save the freedman from the outrage which is his daily life. As a slave he was "a tool without a soul." If you have ceased to treat him according to this ancient definition, it is only because you treat him even as something less. In your cruel philosophy he is only "a cipher," without the protection which the slave sometimes found in the self-interest of the master, or, rather let me say he is only a "cipher" where rights are concerned, but a numeral counted by millions where taxes are to be paid. The freedman is compelled not only to pay taxes; he must fight also, and he must obey the laws; three things which he cannot escape. But according to the primal principle of republican government, he has an indefeasible right to a voice in determining how to be taxed, when to fight, and what laws to obey, all of which can be secured only through the ballot. Thus again, do I return to the same conclusion, which meets us at every point and every stage, as a commandment which cannot be disobeyed.

Would you secure all the just fruits of this terrible war and trample out the Rebellion in its pernicious assumptions, as in its arms? Then do not hesitate; and this is the last stage of the argument. The Rebellion began in two assumptions, both proceeding from South Carolina: first, the sovereignty of the States, with the pretended right of secession; and, secondly, the superiority of the white race, with the pretended right of Caste, Oligarchy, and Monopoly, on account of color. The first was often announced in every way. The second showed itself at the beginning, when South Carolina alone, among the thirteen States, allowed her Constitution to be degraded by an exclusion on account of color; but it did not receive the authoritative statement until a later day, when that wicked evangelist, Mr. Calhoun, taking issue with the Declaration of Independence, audaciously announced in the Senate that to declare all were born free and equal was "the most dangerous of all political errors; and that it had done more to retard the cause of civilization, and is doing more at present than all other causes combined; that we now begin to experience the danger of admitting so great an error to have a place in the Declaration of Independence." [*Calhoun's Speeches, vol. iv., p. 54.*] These two assumptions are kindred in effrontery. All agree that the dogma of State Sovereignty must be repelled; but this is less offensive than that other dogma, having the same origin, that the Declaration of Independence is "the most dangerous of all political errors." To repel such an effrontery is not enough; it must be scorned.

The gospel, according to Calhoun, is only another statement of the imposture that this august Republic, founded to sustain the rights of Human Nature, is nothing but "a white man's government." The whole assumption is ignoble, utterly unsupported by history, and insulting to the fathers, while it is offensively illogical and irreligious. It is illogical, inasmuch as our fathers, when they declared that all men are created equal, gave expression to a truth of political science, which, from the nature of the case, admits no exception. As an axiom it is without exception; for it is the essence of an axiom, whether in geometry or morals, to be universal. As an abstract truth it is also without exception, according to the requirement of such truth. And, finally, as a self-evident truth, so announced in the great Declaration, it is without exception; for only such truth can be self-evident. Thus, whether axiom, abstract truth, or self-evident truth, it is always universal. But the assumption is not only illogical, it is irreligious, inasmuch as it flies in the face of that living truth which appears twice at the Creation: first, when God said, "Let us make man in our own image;" and, secondly, in the Unity of the race then divinely appointed, and which appears again in the Gospel, when it was said, "God that made the world, and all things therein, hath made of one blood all nations of men." According to the best testimony now, the population of the earth—embracing Caucasians, Mongolians, Malays, Africans and Americans—is about thirteen hundred millions, of whom only three hundred and seventy-five millions are "white men," or little less than one-fourth, so that, in claiming exclusive right for "white men," you degrade nearly three-quarters of the Human Family, made in the "image of God" and declared to be of "one blood," while you sanction a Caste offensive to religion, an Oligarchy inconsistent with republican government, and a Monopoly, which has the whole world as its foot-stool.

Against this assumption I protest with mind, soul and heart. It is false in religion, false in statesmanship, and false in economy. It is an extravagance, which, if enforced, is foolish tyranny. Show me a creature, with erect countenance looking to Heaven, made in the image of God, and I show you a MAN, who, of whatever country or race, whether darkened by equatorial sun, or blanched by Northern cold, is with you a child of the Heavenly Father and equal with you in title to all the rights of Human Nature. You cannot deny these rights without impiety. And so has God linked the national welfare with national duty; you cannot deny these rights without peril to the Republic. It is not enough that you have given Liberty. By the same title that we claim Liberty do we claim Equality also. One cannot be denied without the other. What is Liberty without Equality? What is Equality without Liberty? One is the complement of the other. The two are necessary to round and complete the circle of American citizenship. They are the two lobes of the mighty lungs through which the people breathe the breath of life. They are the two vital principles of a republican government, without which a government, although republican in name, cannot be republican in fact. These two vital principles belong to those divine statutes which are graven on the heart of Universal Man, even upon the heart of the slave who forgets them, and upon the heart of the master who denies them; and whether forgotten or denied, they are more enduring than marble or brass, for they share the perpetuity of the Human Family.

The Roman Cato, after declaring his belief in the immortality of the soul, added, that, if this were an error, it was an error which he loved. And now, declaring my belief in Liberty and Equality as the God-given birthright of all men, let me say, in the same spirit, if this be an error, it is an error which I love; if this be a fault, it is a fault which I shall be slow to renounce; if this be an illusion, it is an illusion which I pray may wrap the world in its angelic forms.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1866.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

NO STATE SHALL MAKE ANY DISTINCTION IN CIVIL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES AMONG THE NATURALIZED CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES RESIDING WITHIN ITS LIMITS, OR AMONG PERSONS BORN ON ITS SOIL OF PARENTS PERMANENTLY RESIDENT THERE, ON ACCOUNT OF RACE, COLOR, OR DESCENT.

OUR "POOR WHITE" PRESIDENT.

IT is the misfortune of this country to have for President a man who combines in his own person some very essential disqualifications for his office. The party known as Democratic has been overthrown, but our President is one bred up in the traditions of that party, and still clinging to its exploded dogmas. The North and the South have had a great battle, and the North has triumphed; but a Southerner sits in the Executive chair. He is not merely a Southerner, but one of that class of Southerners known as Poor Whites. We do not recall that fact by way of taunt, but it is necessary to keep it in mind in order to explain the prejudices and narrowness peculiar to that class, and which Mr. Johnson has not outgrown. A courageous devotion to the Union during the last four years gave him such political prominence that the Conservative faction of the Republicans, to which Mr. Johnson had steadily adhered, were enabled to nominate him for Vice-President. Becoming President by accident, his subsequent career has brought out, in a way most detrimental to the country, the traits which his origin and history implanted and developed in him. They have appeared most offensively during the last week in his interviews with the colored delegation, and with the delegation from Virginia.

Messrs. Douglass, Downing, and their colleagues, are in Washington to look after the interests of their race. They may fairly be considered to represent four millions of people. In the interest of this vast number they visit the President, to express to him their conviction that a nominal emancipation has left these millions still in peril, and still needing legislation to guarantee to them their civil and political rights. Mr. Douglass condenses their claim into a sentence when he says: "The fact that we are the subjects of Government and subject to taxation, to volunteer in the service of the country, subject to being drafted, subject to bear the burdens of the State, makes it not improper that we should ask to share in the privileges of the condition."

We add what he modestly forbore to press, that the oppression of his race by the Government, their magnanimous forgetfulness of it in the hour of that Government's peril, and their heroic services in its defence, give the colored people of America a claim if possible still stronger than the one they present to an immediate and complete recognition of all their rights as citizens.

The President replies in substance—"What some people say about Justice and the Declaration of Independence is all very fine, no doubt; but it's mere talk. When we come down to facts, here is an ignorant mass of negroes, who have gained by emancipation more than they really deserve, and who ought to understand that they have no business to vote, and are in danger of getting their heads broken if they try it. My advice to them is to be satisfied with what they have got, or, if they don't like it, go elsewhere."

One of the most brutal and insolent speeches anywhere on record. We do not, of course give the word; but the spirit of the harangue is faithfully represented in this summary. Let us take a sentence as specimen:

"The colored man went into this rebellion a slave; by the operation of the rebellion he came out a freedman, equal to a freedman in other portions of the country. There is a great deal done for him on this point. The non-slaveholder who was forced into the rebellion, and was as loyal as those that lived beyond the limits of the State, was carried into it and his property, and is a number of instances the lives of such were sacrificed; and he who has survived has come out of it with nothing gained, but a great deal lost. Now, upon a principle of justice, should they be placed in a condition different from what they were before? On the one hand one has gained a great deal, on the other hand one has lost a great deal, and in a political point of view scarcely stands where he did before."

In other words, because a few loyalists, "forced into the rebellion"—and they were very few—have suffered the consequences of their acquiescence in a great crime, the four millions of loyalists who refused to be forced into rebellion, and who stood by the flag in the darkest hours of the war, are to be denied the rights which no man thinks of denying to those whose only superior merit is in having a white skin. That is Presidential logic, worthy of a statesman who echoes the Compromise sneer at the Declaration of Independence as a glittering generality. Take another specimen. The President affects to believe that to give the ballot to the blacks will bring on a conflict between the races and result in the extermination of the colored race. Who will begin the conflict? Certainly not the blacks, for they will have gained what they want. Mr. Johnson must mean that the whites will be enraged by the concession of political equality to the blacks, and attempt to destroy them by arms; but that is an argument against *white* suffrage. Nor does the President impose even on himself by this sophistry. He does not believe in such a conflict. There can only be a conflict by opposition between the two; but Mr. Johnson, with amusing inconsistency, asserts in another part of his conversation that the ballot will be of no use to the black because the master will control his vote.

Mr. Douglass—But the masters have the making of the laws, and we cannot get away from the plantations.

The President—What prevents you?

Mr. Douglass—We have not the simple right of locomotion through the Southern States.

The President—If the master now controls the freedman, would he not control his vote.

One of the speakers in this dialogue is President of the United States, representing by his official position, what there is best in the civilization of the Anglo-Saxon race. The other is Frederick Douglass, a negro, with nothing to back him but his own manhood and talent. Yet, if we are compelled to accept Andrew Johnson as our representative, we blush for the white race. Dignity, force of speech, modesty, manliness, simple faith in justice, weight of character, are all on the side of the negro. It would be hard to surpass the brief address of Frederick Douglass, for fitness to the occasion and point. It would be hard to find a worse speech than the diffuse, illogical, clumsy, and coarse reply of the President.

The published reply of the delegation is a complete answer, so far as it undertakes to answer the President's statement. It omits to notice one essential point. This white [illegible], who parades his attachment to Democracy, does not know the meaning of the word. His idea of a Democratic Republic, is a government by caste and race. These are his words:

"You have spoken about government. Where is power derived from? We say it is derived from the people. Let us take it so and refer to the District of Columbia by way of illustration. Suppose, for instance, here in this political community, which, to a certain extent, must have government, must have law, and, putting it now upon the broadest basis you can put it, take into consideration the relation which the white has heretofore borne to the colored race, is it proper to force upon this community, without their consent, the elective franchise, without regard to color, making it universal?"

That is sheer political atheism. "The people," in Andrew Johnson's mind, are the *white* people. He proclaims it not "proper" to force upon the people of the District of Columbia the elective franchise, without regard to color, "without their consent." Whose consent? How has anybody's consent or dissent been expressed? The whites of that District have held an election and voted that they don't want the blacks to have the franchise. When the blacks have held an election and voted either that they do or don't want it, or don't want the whites to have it, then perhaps "the people" will have had a chance to express their opinion. Until then, the assertion of Andrew Johnson, that the people of the District are opposed to universal suffrage, proves him ignorant of the first principles of the government he attempts to administer. We think the colored delegation should have presented that view of the case to him, and when he talked of referring to the people the question, whether four millions should have political rights, their representatives should have answered, We are a part of the people, and no decision on such point is valid if we are excluded from a share in making it.

SONNET.

TO WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

Grand pioneer, in grandest work of love,
Well may'st thou feel thy task completely done,
And on the cloud-rifts of thy setting sun
See only light from all beneath, above!
Let thy co-workers, thy successors, move
Onward, until *their* ample course is run,
And they, like thee, receive their Lord's "well done!"—
Till on their spirits rests the Heavenly Dove.
What matters now the once ignoble name,
If under *it* men fight the present wrong,
Prove themselves ranked for Holy battle strong,
And win for it a deeper, fuller fame,
Or yield it to be merged in term more new?—
Enough that each to his own soul be true.

Feb. 3, 1866. E. A. K.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR PRESIDENT LINCOLN.

EVERYTHING in Washington gave way on Monday to the memorial services for President Lincoln. The oration was delivered in the Representatives Hall by Hon. George Bancroft. The New York *Times* says there "were present the usual distinguished representation of people of high positions in the capital, beginning, for instance, with the Lieutenant-General, and running down to the latest brevet brigadier-general, with Admiral Shubrick, and running down through the grades of the navy to a lieutenant-commander. The President and the entire Cabinet, save Mr. Seward; the Judges of the Supreme Court, all save Justice Grier; the Diplomatic Corps, not all, but many, including Bruce, Gerolt, Stoeckl, Tassara, Raasloff, and others; the Senate in force, the House of Representatives almost unanimously. These were all there seated just as ordered, presenting a picture of intellectual power, political fame, military glory and courtly dignity such as is seldom seen even within the halls of the Capital in these eventful years so productive of lasting history and great men."

The oration is too long for our space, even were it germane to the mission of THE STANDARD. It is severely criticized by many who doubtless would gladly praise it, and applauded of course in the opposite hemisphere. The *Times* is silent upon it. The *Tribune's* Washington correspondent writes: "The opinion that Mr. Bancroft's attacks on foreign Governments on the occasion of the obsequies of Mr. Lincoln, in the presence of the representatives of these Governments as the guests of the nation, was an unjustifiable act of impropriety, is quite generally entertained and openly expressed here." The *Herald* says: "The oration is very capital reading. As a whole it is far superior to anything Mr. Bancroft has done before. His eulogy upon President Jackson was by no means so vigorous, so graphic and so condensed. Mr. Bancroft was invited to deliver this oration after Secretary Stanton and other distinguished persons had declined; and the selection took the country somewhat by surprise. No one could see then, and we doubt whether any one can explain now, what special appropriateness there was in requesting Polk's Secretary of the Navy to officiate upon this occasion. But if chance guided the choice of the Congressional Committee, the chance was certainly a very fortunate one; for the oration read by Mr. Bancroft before the imposing assemblage at the Capitol is composed in the style of the articles in old *Blackwood*, and is, consequently, sure of popularity. To simply eulogize is really very fatiguing work, and Mr. Bancroft has relieved his labor by sharp, spicy hits at everything and everybody; so that we feel none of the dreariness of the funeral sermon while perusing his oration, but are able to enjoy all the liveliness of a smart political review."

The opinion likely to crystalize into general consent is, that it was a sort of stump speech of a pretty high order, but wholly out of time and place for an occasion like that which called it forth; an occasion not indeed very infrequent, as it has come to be almost a consequent upon democratic defeats in Presidential elections; a fact of which it would seem the country would do well to take more notice, at least in its selections of candidates for Vice-Presidents.

THE JOHN BROWN HOMESTEAD.—We clip the following from the San Francisco *Elevator*:

"Four lots on the west side of Main street, in the south end of Red Bluff, have been enclosed with a neat board fence, and a dwalling, worth about $500, is to be erected on the lots, to be completed in January. This will constitute the 'John Brown Cottage,' and will be the home of the widow and three children of Old John Brown."

The Tehama (California) *Observer*, published at Red Bluff, says:

"The John Brown Cottage is nearly completed, and will be a very pretty home for the family, and they appreciate it, too. The carpenters, Bierce & Powell, have displayed good taste in the style and finish of the building."

PRESIDENTIAL LOGIC.

THERE were men who used to exclaim about Mr. Lincoln's unbeautiful style—the phrases that were as quaint as his face, and the expressions that were as awkward as his figure. Yet we are almost convinced that even Mr. Lincoln's school-day compositions, were nobler specimens of English eloquence and English common sense than the speech to which Mr. Johnson lately treated the country. Next to his address to the black regiment, his last effort to the Colored Delegation was one of the most brilliant examples of Presidential rhetoric the world has seen for some time. As regards its repetitions, the awkwardness of its construction and the general confusedness of its statements, we have rarely seen its equal. We do not expect that every man shall have an oration at his fingers' ends upon a moment's notice, but we do ask that every man of even ordinary common sense and commonplace education, shall be able to express his views with something like clearness, and with something like coherency. "Every noble idea," says Madame de Stael, "comes to us clothed in a noble garb." The conclusion would seem to be that President Johnson had not only no noble ideas in his heart while addressing the Colored Delegation, but no ideas at all. He used so many words because he did not know what to say. It is almost painful to follow up the gaps in his train of thought and would-be arguments, and the efforts by which he tries to connect the broken links again. If there had been any frank and manly sympathy for these noble representatives of an unfortunate race that stood before him, he would have been able to express it in language as frank and manly as befitted the occasion. Mr. Johnson begins by giving the Delegation the comforting assurance, that he will not make a speech, because it is "always best to talk plainly and distinctly on such questions." Why he should fail in the latter if he attempted the former, is hard to see, but that he did not succeed in talking plainly and distinctly, is very clear indeed. The President next, as usual referred to his antecedents, and told the Delegation what probably somewhat astonished them, that, "for the colored race my means, my friends, my all have been perilled." If no other Moses could be found to lead them from slavery to freedom, he would be their Moses. But he was unwilling to engage in a course which would result in a war between the two races. He believed that a great hatred existed between the negroes and the poor whites, and that therefore it was unwise to give the ballot to the negro at this time; and "the query comes up, will we not then commence a war of races? Now we are talking about where we are going to begin." After working through a weary mass of meaningless words, this, then, is the conclusion arrived at, and this the argument put forth—that because in times of slavery the most ignorant among the negroes respected the slaveholders more than the poor non-slaveholding whites, and because a hatred exists between the two classes, therefore it is not safe to entrust the negro with the ballot, for fear a war of races ensue. The hatred of the whites to the blacks, and the danger that might therefrom result to the latter, is not mentioned, as a matter of course. Mr. J. did well, we think, if doing unfairly is ever well, in expressing unwillingness to listen to a verbal reply from the Colored Delegation. He thereby spared himself the humiliation of being shamed by the intellect, the eloquence and the uprightness of a race whose only liberty is the right to work, and whose only duty not to lie down in dissipation. Every loyal man must have rejoiced at the admirably clear and noble manner, the unanswerable logic by which the Delegation replied to the President. No man of common sense but must see that the difference between the intelligence of a white reconstructionist and a colored loyalist, is not so immensely in favor of the former, and that that man should not be allowed to influence public sentiment, whose views and opinions are justly styled "entirely unsound, and prejudicial to the highest interests of our country."

TENNESSEE PROSCRIPTION.—The Philadelphia *North American* says truly: "The Tennessee rebels, who, while they governed that State in 1861, exiled some, imprisoned some, and murdered a good many Union men; who put in force a proscription as general as it was bitter, and spared neither age nor sex, are now very plaintive against the reorganized State Legislature, and accuse it of proscribing recent rebels. These very rebels, while in our power, denounced, excluded and proscribed in every conceivable method, men who were guilty of no crime and charged with no fault save their loyalty. People fled from the State by hundreds to save their lives, and enough could not escape to prevent many murders. The very men who were the assailants and instruments in that list of atrocities which stretched the color of the dark and bloody ground of Kentucky over Tennessee, are the ones who are now loud-mouthed against the Legislature of that State, and who think there is an awful proscription because they are not reclothed with all

ating the loyal people of a country to please the traitors! Suppose they were gone, who would fight the battles of the Republic when Mr. Johnson's pet snakes get up their next rebellion?"

PERSONAL.

The Washington *Reconstructionist* contains the following frightful account: "Mr. Hopewell, a respectable colored man of this city, called at our office yesterday in company with Laundros Williams, of Talladega county. Mr. Williams says that while engaged in drawing a seine in Coosa river he drew up fifteen dead bodies of colored people—one of them a woman with a child in her arms. The bodies were yet unburied at last accounts."

Gen. Butler, it is said, has just closed negotiations for a valuable mill property on the James River, near Richmond, intending to erect extensive cotton factories. The Cox farm, containing 2,800 acres, through which runs Dutch Gap Canal, has been offered to the General, and he has in contemplation its purchase. He intends that New England families and mill operators shall be settled upon it.

Mr. A. T. Foss, of New Hampshire, is supplying a pulpit for the Spiritualists in one of their meetings up town. A writer to a Chicago journal says: "It is no lie to call him the "War-Horse" of Spiritualism. He had an intelligent and appreciative audience last Sunday, notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather. He is alive to the truth, and all who hear him cannot but know the fact."

The papers seem to credit, as there is no reason why they should not, a rumor from the Newbern (N. C.) *Times*, that Capt. (late Rev.) Horace James, superintendent of the Freedmen's Bureau in that district, went to Washington on business connected with his office, when he was assailed by rowdies and most shamefully beaten. On reporting the same to headquarters here, a detachment of ten men, under command of a lieutenant, whose name we did not learn, was sent over to set things to rights, when they waylaid the party and shot the lieutenant.

A Washington dispatch to the *Tribune* says, the recent maltreatment of Capt. Johnson in Florida, by ex-rebels, seems to have been a maturely organized affair. The mob also called upon the United States District Attorney and ordered him to leave the State forthwith, or forfeit his life. It is stated that the civil authorities lend their countenance to these outrages, and the military is at present inadequate to protect Union men from these assaults. The determination is to drive out all Yankees from the State.

Rev. Dr. Chaplin writes an interesting letter from New Orleans to the *Era*, upon the importance of educating the colored ministers of the South. Says Dr. Chaplin: "It is interesting to observe with what readiness the colored people appreciate the importance of education. Visiting the Fred. Douglass Colored School, I saw at one end of a class of little urchins a man fifty years old. He told me he could earn two or two and a half dollars a day, and yet he was devoting three days in the week to learning to read and write. There are several evening schools for colored adults, who pay one dollar a month for tuition. Some of the *boys* and *girls* are gray headed, and wear spectacles. The Douglass school is held in an old slave-mart, and over the door may still be read, beneath the black paint (*black*, figuratively as well as literally) which the hand of Freedom has drawn over the words: '*Virginia negroes for sale by I. Bruin.*' Mr. Ruby, principal of the Douglass school, is from Portland, Me. All the teachers in this school are colored. One, a young lady, is from Ohio; another from Nantucket."

Rev. Dr. Lathrop gives in the *Examiner and Chronicle* the results of his observations during a somewhat extended tour in the Southern States. Upon the subject of co-operation he says: "The question now arises—and this is the main point—What is the attitude of the Southern churches as to the question of co-operation with the North in missionary and other kindred operations? To this question I reply, at once and emphatically: *There is no prospect of any immediate co-operation, in the formal or organic sense.* Indeed, the hope of any such co-operation must be indefinitely postponed. Notwithstanding the conciliatory spirit which individuals here and there possess, and notwithstanding the readiness of a few—very few—of the churches to take their stand on the broad national platform, there is still so general and decided an aversion to anything like voluntary union with the North, that the advocacy of such a course before any of the public religious bodies of the South would be regarded as an evidence of insanity on the part of him who should have the temerity to utter the offensive words."

The Missouri *Democrat* says, we learn, with special pleasure, that the man who perhaps is the best fitted to write the biography and delineate the characteristics of Mr. Lincoln, is engaged in the task. Hon. Wm. H. Herndon, the law partner of Mr. Lincoln from 1844 to the close of his life, has fairly won distinction by the peculiarly instructive analysis he has already given to the public—in the form of lectures—of the great martyr's mind and heart. Our readers will read with lively interest the following from the Springfield (Ill.) *Journal*: "We learn that our distinguished fellow-citizen, Hon. Wm. H. Herndon, is writing an authentic history of the life of the late President Lincoln. In order to prepare himself for this important and interesting task, Mr. Herndon visited Menard county and various other localities, rich in incidents connected with the early life of the distinguished man; has conversed with men who acted with Mr. Lincoln as friends or opposed him as enemies, and has collected many facts known only to the few, which will place the noble martyr higher in the estimation of the world than ever before. Mr. H. will visit Coles and Macon counties, in this State; Spencer county, in Indiana; and, if necessary, Kentucky, in the prosecution of the work. Every incident connected with the early life of Mr. Lincoln, so far as they can be obtained, will be embodied in the forthcoming volume. Mr. Herndon is eminently fitted for the work, having been the law partner of Mr. Lincoln from 1844 to the time of Mr. Lincoln's death, and consequently knows more of his inner life, habits of thought, sayings and doings, than almost any other man living, and will therefore be able to produce a work full of interest and perfectly authentic."

WENDELL PHILLIPS AT BROOKLYN.—On Tuesday evening Mr. Phillips gave an address to one of the most brilliant assemblies ever convened in Brooklyn, completely filling the Academy of Music, and listening with profound attention until near ten o'clock. Mr. Phillips spoke on National Affairs, which he analyzed in his usual masterly manner, as we hope next week to show to our readers, in a satisfactory manner.

PRAYING BY TELEGRAPH.—A correspondent of the *Times* writes to learn the object aimed at by the Associated Press reporter in telegraphing from Washington prayers offered by clergymen on public occasions. We can imagine no other reason, the *Times* answers, than that the reporter in question must labor under the delusion that these petitions can only reach their destination *via* New York, and that it is a great point gained to give them so much of a start by telegraph.

WORCESTER FREEDOM CLUB.—The Freedom Club, at a special meeting last week, in view of the late intelligence from Washington, took action and ordered to be printed, as follows:

Resolved, That, in the judgment of the Worcester Freedom Club, the thanks of the nation are due to the delegation of colored men in Washington, who have drawn from the President sooner than would otherwise have appeared, a clear and explicit declaration of his views upon the great question of the hour and the age, Impartial Manhood Suffrage.

Resolved, That in now breaking to the hope of the colored man, as President of the United States, the promise made to the ear as Provisional Governor of Tennessee—that he would be their Moses to lead them forth from bondage to freedom, by explaining it to mean a process of expatriation, whereby "he would pass them from a land where they had lived in slavery to a land of freedom, and would pass with them through the Red Sea to the land of promise"—President Johnson has himself furnished the proof of what discerning men have been all along in fear, since the assassination of President Lincoln, *that we have in the Presidency a Southern Democrat, who holds that this is a white man's country, and who means while he is President that it shall be a white man's government.*

Resolved, That in ignoring as a part of the people of the United States, entitled to full equality before the law, the men in whose hands President Lincoln placed the sword to assist in saving the nation; and in denying to those men *who have saved the nation by the sword*, the ballot with which now to save themselves from their domestic enemies, President Johnson reveals the inherent injustice and meanness that belong to men brought up in slavery, and which nothing but an education in freedom can remove.

Resolved, That we trust the revelation now made will convince our National Congress that the best way to prevent the war of races which the President affects to fear, and therefore proposes emigration *from* the South to one of these races, is to make both the races equal before the law, and thereby to destroy at once the vile barrier of caste which slavery alone has reared between them, and prove to the world that the saved and compacted nation of the United States is magnanimous enough to recognize, in the conquered South, loyal black men as of no less account than pardoned, but still hostile white rebels.

LETTER FROM MRS. GAGE.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 6, 1866.

To the Editor of the Standard.

SIR: Washington is just now, as gay as wealth and fashion can make it, and the influx of visitors from every section of this vast country, fills the avenues of the city of "magnificent distances" full to repletion. One at a distance may be appalled at the long array of Honorables, Major-Generals and Brigadiers, of Rear-Admirals, Admirals, Colonels, Captains etc., etc., which grace the columns of the *Chronicle* (by the way, the best paper in the city) every morning, but when one actually comes in contact with these dignitaries, they are not very frightful after all.

These receptions which "we read about," are very equalizing things in society. Men who hold high position, on the tenure of the people's will, must not "put on airs," now that the oligarchy has gone, or is about to go *down*. And perhaps no American Congress ever drew so many of its members from the common walks of useful and honorable life as the present. I say honorable, because usefulness, if accompanied by earnestness and morality, gives the title of honorable in a private way to every man who lives them.

"Trades and callings" are largely represented, and some, the boldest and strongest of our public servants, look back to an origin that the F. F.'s of the South used to slur. It won't do now. So the visitors of Washington go to the receptions, with a full feeling that they are a part and parcel of the National Government, and have as good a right as anybody to "speak in meeting."

There is great extravagance in dress, and an exceeding want of good taste is sometimes met with. But on the whole, excepting long trains, the mass of the people are quite sensible. Only a very few comparatively appear in what is called "full dress"—I suppose because it falls so far short of full dress, and the uncovered neck and arms do not seem at all popular. Now and then a lady glides into the charmed circle, enamelled—the very fright of frights of the evening—looking for all the world like the huge, unsightly figures that whirl in shop windows, where millinery is kept for sale. Only these real faces and physiques are not half so fine. Oh, dear! if they only knew how everybody laughs at them, how utterly disgusting they appear, how all honest womanhood is belittled, I wonder if they would do it? It is a great fashion just now to black the eye-brows—well, what next?

The elegance and richness of costume of a few are wonderful to behold; but it is often the case that, side by side with costly velvets and laces, a plain silk and common cloak, without the least pretension, pass with more *eclat*. Yes, receptions are great levellers of aristocracy, a great recognition of the rights of the masses, as well as a recognition of the right of the individual to some portion of undisturbed time. But I did not intend to write a letter about fashion and reception—not I; but such things will creep in, you know. By the way, the "Hutchinsons—John and family"—have been here nearly two weeks, singing their songs of freedom, and to-day they go to Baltimore, where the colored people make a demonstration in their behalf at Douglass Lyceum Hall—a new, fine building dedicated to their use. We have met them in divers places, at one of President Johnson's receptions, and in the house of Speaker Colfax. At one of his brilliant levees, they charmed the company present with two or three of their patriotic, sweet and mirthful songs. They are engaged for a week to come. The world does move, and these good singers help to move it. The slave has no better friends than they.

Congress is hammering away at the Freedmen's work—the leading men persistently and consistently meeting their opponents at every turn, after their own idea of right, believing, as they do, that "a soft word turneth away wrath, but grievous words stir up anger." They make no loud or open demonstrations against President Johnson's policy personally; but march on with their own work, hour by hourr, without a faltering or backward step. Senator Sumner has to-day begun a great speech in the House, which opens grandly. I shall hear its end to-morrow.

FEBRUARY 7th.

That great speech is concluded. Oh, what a speech! What colossal utterances! What a summing up of the rights of humanity! How, through the debris of all the past, has he searched for all the bolts and bars that, through the past reign of slavery's terror, have been torn ruthless from the temple of freedom, making it almost a shattered ruin, and buried beneath the frightful implements of tyranny and madness.

Up out of their ignoble hiding places he has brought them, unsullied as diamonds, sparkling in their own pure lustre, and has linked them together with his own pure, golden thoughts, to again fasten in its place forever more the keystone of the arch of our Government, "Universal suffrage," as the only true guarantee of "a republican form of government" to every State in this Union; "Taxation without representation is tyranny;" "All just governments derive their power from the consent of of the governed;" "All men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are those of LIFE, LIBERTY and the pursuit of happiness."

The old Declaration of Independence seemed to have had a new resurrection. The angel of Massachusetts had rolled the stone away under which the crucifiers had buried it, and it came forth clothed in new garments of light and glory.

The galleries of the Senate chamber were full to overflowing, every doorway and hall crowded; every step and stairway had its occupant. As his deep, full voice swelled up to that crowd, and sentence after sentence of the eloquence of truth filled our ears, vast as was the crowd, it was awed into a silence that was almost more than silence. Old men leaned forward over their seats, and their eyes seemed going out of their sockets in the long, straining intensity; women by hundreds stilled every nerve and staid every fluttering fan, lest some word should escape. Oh! what a time was that for the dark-browed race that filled a part of these galleries. Could they not see the mighty sledge-hammer in that giant hand, that was crumbling prejudice into fragments and grinding into powder the meanness and wrong of the usurpers of special rights and privileges? And woman, what an argument was that for woman—every line of it a clarion note forever in our cause. "No taxation without representation, no just government without the consent of the governed." What if he did not name us? We are there, and no hand in all this universe of God the Father can ever strike down that lofty pile of architectural argument which he has builded in our behalf out of blocks of granite hewn by our forefathers, and now cemented with the blood and tears of a nation. He has builded broad enough for all, and when our turn shall come its golden gates will open, as well for the mothers, wives and sisters of men, as for men themselves.

Those who feel that little or no advance has been made in the social condition of the colored race, should be here to see. There may be those ignoble enough to spurn or ill-treat persons of darker skin than their own, just as these same ignoble people turn up their noses at white people in plain or poor garments that come in their way. But the colored men and women walk the marble halls with firm step, sit in the galleries, and mingle in the crowd; and so far I have not been able to discover by word or look that they were not considered as a fully privileged class. Little children born to the awful heritage of slavery, now forever free, bound up the long steps and go skipping through the corridors with their school books under their arms, gladsome as birds in spring.

True, they have to hear cruel and false remarks from some vexed Kentuckian or discomfitted politician of the North, who cannot forego his natural propensity to strike, whether he hits or misses; but they care little so long as they see the talent, eloquence, and strength, as well as numbers, are on their side in this noble Congress of 1866. A vote of three to one is a sovereign antidote for the most venomous bite of the serpent.

F. D. GAGE.

P. S.—You will see by the Congressional reports that Miss Clara Barton, who has been engaged since the close of the war in receiving letters of inquiry and answering some, from friends of missing soldiers, has presented a memorial to Congress, calling their attention to the importance and magnitude of the work. We hope it will not be passed by lightly, as the bereaved wives and mothers of these missing men have a right to ask of the Government what they have done with their protectors and friends. Miss Barton has hitherto carried on this noble and generous work entirely upon her own responsibility. But it has outgrown her strength, and it is meet that it should now become the nation's privilege to forward it to completion.

F. D. G.

LETTER FROM MISS PUTNAM.

FARMERSVILLE, N. Y., Feb., 1866.

To the Editor of the Standard:

THE simple name of this little village and large town tells the occupation of the people. And as far as woods and pastures, meadows and brooks, valleys and hills, and flocks and herds are concerned, it is as pretty an Arcadia as can be imagined.

Pure water and fine air abound, and give vigorous health to those who use the one and breathe the other. These farms lie at the greatest elevation in the State, between Lake Erie and the Hudson, and from their springs flow waters that mingle with the widely distant gulfs of Mexico and St. Lawrence. We are especially happy to meet here David Carpenter, Esq., who has stood so firmly for Temperance and Freedom. We have come for a little visit among the kind families that welcome us warmly. The place is hallowed to us by the work for Temperance and Education we did here years ago.

Last Sunday, Miss Holley spoke in the Methodist church in behalf of justice to the freedmen. The meeting was unexpectedly large, and the collection handsome.

It would seem that in a locality so secluded, and where sun-shine and free air, and all outward nature are so lovely and winning to "gladness and love," there need be no one found with a heart bitter with prejudice against any colored person God's providence may have brought into the community. But even here, the wicked spirit of caste rules one family, and its children are kept out of the public school, because a black boy goes. They have some difficulty in getting a private teacher, and little Nettie Baker remarked, "if they will wait a little while, the black boy will be able to teach them!" He learns fast, and is quite a favorite in the school, and more fortunate than another colored boy in the next town of Franklinville. He, to his great grief, was shut out of the school by a copperhead who, it is said, cannot read or write his name. This black boy was also brought from the South by an army officer. It was touching to hear of his innocent lament that he could not go to school this winter.

Mr. C. L. Remond is right about the prejudice colored people are everywhere confronted with. Such instances as these I have related, in these extreme rural neighborhoods, are disgraceful, and show the need, as Miss Holley said, when she faithfully rebuked them, of Abolitionists going about, still to declare for justice to the wronged and victim race.

How mean this spirit of persecution is that can stoop to seek to deprive innocent black children of the right to gain knowledge in the public schools!

At her lecture in Franklinville, Miss Holley gave a vivid picture of the sublime scene witnessed in the House of Representatives when the vote for black suffrage in the District of Columbia was declared; and mentioned with honor the vote of Mr. Van Aernem, a citizen of that village and Representative from this Congressional District at Washington, elected to fill the place of Mr. Fenton when that gentleman was made Governor of the State.

More and more are we impressed with the great blessing these meetings and lectures are to the country; and where they have been most frequently held there is more light and juster sentiment prevailing; a higher civilization. We heartily agree with Mr. Alcott, that while there is a quiver of this wrong of slavery, it is all-important the American Anti-Slavery Society should keep on with its work. It is difficult to see how any earnest friend of justice to the black man can for one moment consent to discourage the utmost effort to proclaim that everywhere he must be recognized as a man, equal in rights with any other.

A very excellent meeting was held at Cattaraugus, in the Methodist Church. Mr. Joseph Plumb, a veteran friend of Temperance and Anti-Slavery, and his wife, gave us most cordial welcome to their pleasant mountain home.

In Hinsdale, Miss Holley was called upon to refute the old falsehood spread by the N. Y. *Tribune* (as she has so often done before) that Gerrit Smith did not vote on the Nebraska Bill. An illustration of the old adage that a lie will travel round the world while truth is getting on her boots.

The Sunday was very cold, but there was a good meeting in the Methodist Meeting House. C. P. P.

DOUGLASS AND JOHNSON.

To the Editor of the Standard:

"The *white* man was permitted to vote before government was derived from him."—*A. Johnson.*

SIR: Does not the "old serpent" hide himself as cunningly under the word "white," in the United States as he does under "class" in the Old World? Who were those privileged white men that voted in the beginning, before governments were? For what did they vote?

Did Adam vote himself out of Paradise, or did Noah and his compeers vote themselves into the ark? Have no black men ever had nations, votes or governments? Have all "white men," even in France, England and the United States, been permitted to vote from the beginning? Did Mr. Johnson never hear of black votes deciding an election in a northern State? There have been changes in the fortunes of voters, as in all other privileges.

Jefferson and Adams told us a century ago, that all just governments were derived from the consent of the governed; but now, the President of the United States tells us, that the "white man" is the author of government, and that he voted before governments were.

If there ever was a time when Abolitionists might feel proud of a race they have sought to elevate, it was when Frederick Douglass and Andrew Johnson stood face to face.

There met a negro and a poor white, both having escaped from the bondage of ignorance at the same time. They learned their letters at the age of twenty-one. Douglass wishing to see men under other phases, went beyond Mason and Dixon's line, to study republican institutions in a Northern institute; while Johnson, regarding himself as the future Moses of the oppressed African, decided to remain in his native land, "to sacrifice his life, property and ambition to the welfare of the colored race." But the most apparent and lamentable sacrifice he has made, if we may judge from this interview, has been of his own powers of discrimination.

Who that reads the speeches of the colored delegation, and the President's, can help seeing how much better Douglass understands the philosophy of social life and republican institutions than the President?

This may be partly due to his Northern education, and partly to superior original powers of thought.

As he measured himself with the best man the liberal party could find to represent them as Vice-President, it must have been a proud moment for Douglass. After such an exhibition of white intelligence and statesmanship, he must have felt fresh confidence in his own race, for surely any slave on a Southern plantation could have given a better solution of the problem of Southern life.

That interview illustrates the power of the ballot. Had Douglass been enfranchised when Johnson was, he too could have remained South, and by a constant "sacrifice of life, property and ambition," in the same manner, found his way to the White House, not as a suppliant, but perchance as President of the United States. Talk of educating men for suffrage. That right itself makes manhood; the dignity and responsibility it confers is education.

Why did Andrew Johnson dare to talk in that sneering tone to Frederick Douglass, one of the ablest men in the Empire State? Simply because he represented no power to vote him back to "his property in Tennessee now occupied by his slaves." E. C. S.

Philadelphia Correspondence.

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 9th, 1866.

To the Editor of the Standard:

SIR: On last Tuesday evening, Col. N. W. Daniels and Mrs. Cora L. V. Daniels spoke in National Hall, this city, in relation to the freedmen, for the benefit of the Freedmen's Schools. The publicity of the announcement was somewhat limited, and so, consequently, was the audience; for surely the well-known importance of the subject, and the sympathy as well as interest felt by the people of this community in behalf of the freedmen, together with the remarkable talent of Mrs. Daniels as a superior and eloquent speaker, would have ensured a well-filled hall had a knowledge of the meeting been more widely extended. Col. Daniels was an officer in the Union Army, having had charge of a regiment of colored troops in the south, west. He has had personal opportunities of witnessing the condition of the freedmen in Louisiana, and the operation of the measures connected with their affairs. His testimony is corroborative of that uniformly borne concerning them. In reference to their ability to do for themselves in the practical walks of life, his remarks were emphatic, as coming from one convinced of the truth thereof. Their needs, their distresses, the abuses, wrongs and outrages of which they are the helpless victims, the fiendish atrocities inflicted upon them by brutal and wicked men, all claimed the speaker's attention. He spoke without reserve of the limping, tardy and hesitating policy of the Government respecting them, and the shameful course that either regards indifferently, or utterly ignores, their right to justice as men, and equality as citizens. That vaunting flourish of Andrew Johnson, wherein he promised to be a Moses for their deliverance, in view of his subsequent faithlessness, was treated with merited scorn.

Mrs. Daniels, better known to the public as Cora L. V. Scott, spoke with rare force and eloquence. In her words there was a power that could touch the consciousness of man, and impress upon him a conviction of his neglect and his duty towards the colored people. The high ground she occupies rebukes a common standard, and gives action through policy, an ignoble estimate. I could not too highly praise the marked beauty and excellence of her style, her force of language and readiness of speech, its fervor, strength and boldness.

She denounced that distinction implied by the term *freedmen*, which is a perpetual reminder of their former condition, and of the great crime and assumption of the nation in ever having held them in bondage. She deprecated delay in doing justice to the negro, and rebuked the wretched policy of forever postponing action, of waiting, still waiting until danger and peril shall menace us on every hand, and the enemies of humanity gain a secure foothold for mischief. With indignant scorn she impugned that persistent course of action whereby traitors are befriended and forgiven, while loyal black men are denied their simplest rights. The nation's gratitude to her black soldiers is exemplified by that advice of the Executive which bids them go to their homes when they have no homes—to go to work when they have not a foot of soil that they can call their own. At the same time the sins of the late slaveholders, traitors, are all forgiven, their homes and estates restored to them, and their land given back. Words, she said, are inadequate to express the contempt felt for that kind of charity and benevolence, that despicable spirit of philanthrophy which arrogates to itself the privilege of bestowing freedom upon men, and then deprives them of all that constitutes its true value, and its essential qualities.

In referring to the sphere of action open before us, she remarked that, if we desired the rebels to do justice to the colored people of the South, we should do justice to them here in the North. If we wished them to bestow civil and political rights upon them, we must do the same at home. If we wish them to sweep away all distinctions, and trample prejudice beneath their feet we must put in practice our advice, and do the same here, and not sit down like the Pharisee of old, pointing to the sins of the nation, but regarding not our own.

Beautifully and tenderly she spoke of the motive that should animate us in our work. We should do right because it is right; act justly because it is our duty; advocate truth for its own sake; adhere to principle as an authoritative guide; and not from pity, nor from sympathy merely, nor charity, nor because we remember the great sufferings of this people in the past, and the wrongs they have endured; but because it is just to our own souls, just to our own nation, to the spirit of liberty and right, to our own consciences, that there should be no wrong of whatsoever kind perpetrated in a free government, and sanctioned by a free and enlightened people.

Her closing remarks were most eloquent, and glowed with the fervency of spiritual affection, kindling within us responsive aspirations, and impressing us with a sense of the beauty that dwells in holiness of action, where truth asserts her right, and usefulness is crowned with justice and love. OSCAR.

ENGLISH IDEAS OF LIBERTY.

To the Editor of the Standard:

SIR: In Buckle's History of Civilization, Vol. 1st., pages 350 and 351, are found the following curious illustrations of British ideas of civil liberty so recently as 1795 and 1799. The reader will please recollect that Mr. Buckle is an Englishman, not a Yankee. A law was enacted by the British Parliament in 1795, enacting that "no public meeting should be held for the discussion of political or religious subjects, unless notice of it were inserted in a newspaper five days beforehand; such notice to contain a statement of the objects of the meeting, and of the time and place where it was to assemble." And to bring the whole arrangement completely under the supervision of government, it was ordered that not only should the notice thus published be signed by house-holders, but that the original manuscript should be preserved for the information of the justices of the peace, who might require a copy of it—a significant threat which, in those days, was easily understood. It was also enacted that, after these precautions had been taken, any single justice might compel the meeting to disperse, if, in his opinion, the language held by the speakers was calculated to bring the sovereign or the government into contempt; while, at the same time, he was authorized to arrest those whom he considered to be offenders. The right of putting an end to all public discussions on the most important subjects, was thus lodged in the hands of a man appointed by the crown, and removable by the crown at its own pleasure. To this it was added, that if the meeting should consist of twelve, or upwards of twelve persons, and should remain together for one hour after being ordered to separate—in such case, the *penalty of death was to be inflicted*, even if only twelve disobeyed this arbitrary command of a single and irresponsible magistrate!

In 1799, another law was passed, forbidding any open field, or place of any kind, to be used for lecturing or for debating, unless a specific license for such place had been obtained from the magistrates. It was likewise enacted that all circulating libraries and all reading-rooms should be subject to the same provisions; no person, without leave from the constituted authorities, being permitted to lend on hire in his own house, newspapers, pamphlets, or even books of any kind! Before shops of this sort could be opened, a license must first be obtained from two justices of the peace, which, however, was to be renewed at least once a year, and might be revoked at any intermediate period. If a man lent books without the permission of the magistrates, or if he allowed lectures or debates on any subject whatever to be held under his roof, then, for such grievous offence he was to be fined £100 a-day; and every person who aided him, either by presiding over the discussion or by supplying a book, was for each offence to be fined £20. The proprietor of so pernicious an establishment was not only to suffer from these ruinous fines, but was declared liable to still further punishment as the keeper of a *disorderly house!*"

For aught that appears in Buckle's book, these laws may yet exist. They would suit our Southern *brethren*, if they could be enacted against the freedmen! Great Britain is a *white-man's* government, and these laws were made for *white-men*. ARTHUR MOTT.

DR. THOMAS W. EVANS, the American dentist in Paris, desires to benefit mankind generally, and to confer honor on his native country, by making known abroad a large number of skilful inventions made by his countrymen for relieving sick and wounded soldiers. For this purpose he proposes to establish an American Sanitary Museum in Paris, to be opened at the time of the Great World's Exhibition there next year.

CONGRESS.

THE following from a special correspondent of the N. Y. *Tribune*, will give a fair idea of the doings of Congress since our last to the end of the week:

WASHINGTON, Feb. 10, 1866.

The Senate was not in session to-day.

The House having set aside the whole of Saturday for speech-making on various subjects, no business was transacted. But three speeches were delivered, each of which was in its way remarkable. First, Mr. Ward, from New York, spoke on reconstruction, urging the necessity of exacting guarantees from the rebel States before they could be admitted, and giving an exhaustive account of the present spirit animating the Southern people. It was a very able effort, replete with strong arguments and stirring appeals. At the conclusion of his remarks Mr. Ward received the congratulations of a large number of his political friends. He was followed by Mr. Delano of Ohio, whose intention, evidently, was to refute the positions taken on the reconstruction question by Mr. Stevens of Pennsylvania and Mr. Shellabarger of Ohio.

It so happened, however, that both Mr. Stevens and Mr. Shellabarger denied ever having assumed the position attributed to them by Mr. Delano. Mr. Delano was particularly severe on the subject of confiscation. As to the present status of the rebel States, his reasoning was somewhat confused and disconnected, and he evidently did not succeed in carrying out the line of argument he had laid out for himself. He pronounced himself in favor of the immediate admission of the Tennessee delegation, and, perhaps, Arkansas, but would keep the other States out until they send loyal men to represent loyal constituencies. Mr. Delano gave up the floor before having said all he wanted to say, and his speech will undoubtedly appear better in print than it appeared on its delivery.

Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania then made one of the most important and remarkable speeches of the session. The salient point of his argument was his severe and brilliant criticism of the President's action in taking the whole work of reconstruction into his own hands, and assigning to Congress no other part in the business than that of determining whether the Senators and Representatives sent by the rebel States were regularly elected. The argument was carried out in a masterly manner, bristling with sharp points and sacrastic allusions, uncommonly elegant in language, and most forcible in their illustrations and appeals. When he said that the President's policy in its immediate effects had surpassed the most sanguine expectations of the rebels of the South and of the Democrats of the North, there was a burst of applause on the floor and in the galleries. He then went into a full discussion of the negro question, arguing that the right of voting is one of the necessary incidents of citizenship, and that the people of the Union are in honor bound to give the colored race that helped us in the war all the political means necessary for their self-protection.

The speech occupied about three hours in its delivery, but held the audience, among whom were many Senators, during the entire time in close attention. It was the first speech delivered on the floor of the House devoted principally to a direct and searching criticism of the President's policy; and it was evident that Mr. Williams was giving an expression to feelings which are every day growing stronger in political circles. In point of composition, Mr. Williams' speech challenges comparison with the best oratorical performances of this session. OBSERVER.

Monday having been appropriated to President Lincoln's obsequies, no business was transacted.

On Tuesday the Freedman's Bureau Bill was put into the hands of the President, and at the time of this writing awaits his action.

In the Senate, Mr. Morgan, of New York, presented the credentials of Mr. Lewis E. Parsons, Senator elect from Alabama. Mr. Morgan said: "As the State of Alabama is one of the States that, during the period of four years, has been in rebellion against the United States, and as Congress has not determined whether the political condition of that State is such as to entitle the State to representation in the Senate, I do not expect that Gov. Parsons will be requested to come forward and take the oath at this time, and I will ask that the credentials be received and laid upon the table, to await the further action of the Senate."

It was so ordered.

PETITIONS.

Mr. Wade (Ohio) offered the petition of colored soldiers, asking the right of suffrage.

Mr. Saulsbury (Del.) wished to ask a question: The Senate and the country were very familiar with this word "colored," as applied to the negro race; he would like to know what authority there was for the use of that word? The only place he had ever seen it in history so applied was in the history of St. Domingo, where it was used to denote mulattoes.

FURTHER CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES.

Mr. Fessenden, from the Committee on Reconstruction, reported a joint resolution to amend the Constitution with a Constitutional article, as follows:

"Congress shall have power to make all laws necessary and proper to secure to the citizens of each State the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States, and to all persons of the several States equal protection in the rights of life, liberty, and property."

The resolution was ordered to be printed.

In the Senate Mr. Wilson of Mass. reported a bill to fix the military peace establishment of the United States, as follows: Five regiments artillery, 12 cavalry, 50 infantry, cadets, etc. The five regiments of artillery are now organized, but the organization of the 1st, 2d, 3d and 4th shall be like that of the 5th. The adjutants, quartermasters and commissioners to be extra first lieutenants. To the six cavalry regiments existing there shall be six more added, the first and second lieutenants and two-thirds of the higher officers to be selected from the officers and soldiers of the volunteer force and the other third from the Regular Army. Four companies of each regiment may be drilled as infantry at the discretion of the President. The 50 regiments of infantry are thus made up: Ten regiments now organized of ten companies each, the remaining nine, each with three battalions of eight companies, are made 27 regiments by adding two companies to each battalion; five additional regiments of ten companies each, and eight additional regiments of colored troops, to be officered by officers of colored troops who have distinguished themselves in the field.

[Why not say *white* officers, as is meant? There are other details, plenty of them; but readers of THE STANDARD can have no interest in them after this infamous affront to the loyal and brave black men. How did any officers "distinguish themselves in the field" at the head of "colored troops," only by the heroism of those troops? And this insult must be added to the thousand others already piled, like "Alps on Alps" upon the patient, long suffering and still suffering colored race, whose creation seems to have been not at all for their own use, but for the convenience and happiness, the honor and advancement of others, their white oppressors.]

HOUSE.—In the House of Representatives, Mr. Smith (Ky.) offered a resolution that Mr. James M. Johnson, claiming to be a member elect from the Third Congressional District of Arkansas, be admitted to the privileges of the floor of the House during the pending of his claim as a member thereof.

Mr. Stevens wanted the resolution referred to the Committee on Reconstruction.

Mr. Smith said that Col. Johnson was an applicant for a seat in the Thirty-eighth Congress. His credentials went to the Committee of Elections, but although he was not admitted as a member, the House gave him his per diem and mileage. Col. Johnson was one of the original loyalists of the State of Arkansas, and never surrendered any opinion in favor of the Union. He enlisted a regiment and served as its commander for three years with distinction, in various engagements, and that gentleman had said to him that, if the House should not now grant the privilege of the floor, heretofore accorded, it would be a reflection on his loyalty so evidently manifested during the war. He hoped the House would vote for the resolution, and grant Col. Johnson the privilege. This is apart from the credentials, which have already been referred to the Committee on Reconstruction.

After further discussion by Messrs. Stevens, Kasson, and others, Mr. Stevens moved, and the House laid Mr. Smith's resolution on the table by yeas, 78; nays, 70.

Mr. Bingham (Ohio) from the Joint Select Committee on Reconstruction, reported a joint resolution, embodying the following article in amendment of the Constitution of the United States, to be represented to the Legislatures of the several States for their ratification:

"That Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to secure to the citizens of each State all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States, and to all persons in the several States equal protection in the rights of life, liberty, and property."

Mr. Bingham asked that the resolution be printed and made the special order of the day for next Monday, and from day to day until disposed of.

Mr. Brooks (N. Y.) inquired whether the Committee on Reconstruction had a right to report at any time and make a special order.

The Speaker replied they had not, but that unanimous consent was required for a special order.

Mr. Brooks said that what was to be done with the resolution had better be done to-day.

Mr. Bingham, at the suggestion of Mr. Stevens, moved to recommit the resolution and that it be printed. Motion agreed to.

RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS.—The Charleston (S. C.) *Leader* says:

"We have several times alluded to the fact that the Constitution of the United States guarantees to every citizen the right to keep and bear arms. Gen. Tilson, Assistant Commissioner, for Georgia, has issued a circular, in which he clearly defines this right as follows:

"IV. Article II of the amendment to the Constitution of the United States, gives the people the right to bear arms, and states that this right '*shall not be infringed.*' Any person, white or black, may be disarmed if convicted of making an improper and dangerous use of weapons; but no military or civil officer has the right or authority to disarm any class of people, thereby placing them at the mercy of others. All men, without distinction of color, have the right to keep arms to defend their homes, families or themselves."

We are glad to learn that Gen. Scott, Commissioner for this State, has given freedmen to understand that they have as good a right to keep fire-arms as any other citizens. The Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land, and we will be governed by that at present.

DEATH OF ROBERT CARY.—The venerable Robert Cary, the father of Alice and Phœbe Cary, died in Cincinnati on the 11th inst. Mr. Cary was nearly eighty years of age, and was one of the first settlers of Cincinnati.

Special Notices.

GEO. L. STEARNS & CO.,

MANUFACTURERS OF

PATENT IMPOVED LEAD PIPE,

PURE BLOCK TIN PIPE AND SHEET LEAD,

ALSO DEALERS IN

PIG AND BAR LEAD,

COPPER AND IRON PUMPS

HYDRAULIC RAMS, etc.

129 MILK STREET,

BOSTON.

GEO. L. STEARNS,
WM. J. BRIDE.

SOLDIERS

OF THE 29TH AND 31ST REGIMENTS OF U. S. COLORED TROOPS

who have not received their full bounty, should apply at once at the

UNITED STATES ARMY AGENCY,

64 Bleecker street, New York.

ALLCOCK'S POROUS PLASTERS.

CURE LUMBAGO, PAINS OF THE SIDE, VARICOSE VEINS, SORE CHEST, ETC.,

An Electrician, who has great experience of their effects in *local rheumatism*, in *tic doloreux*, and deep-seated nervous and other pains, and in affections of the kidney, etc., etc., attributes all their sedative, stimulative, and pain-relieving effects to their electric qualities. He asserts they restore the healthy electric condition (equilibrium) of the part, and *that* being restored, pain and morbid action cease.

LAME BACK.

Brandreth House, New York, November 23, 1859.

T. ALLCOCK & CO.—*Gentlemen:* I lately suffered severely from a weakness in my back. Having heard your Plasters much recommended in cases of this kind I procured one, and the result was all that I could desire. A single Plaster cured me in a week.

Yours respectfully, J. G. BRIGGS.

General Agency, Brandreth House, New York.

Sold by all dealers in Medicines.

CRISTADORO'S EXCELSIOR HAIR DYE.

Old Father Time takes many a year
To turn to white dark colored hair;
But instantly the EXCELSIOR DYE
Brings back the tint that charms the eye;
And Nature owns that cunning Art
Can her own living hues impart.

Sold by druggists and applied by all Hair Dressers.

Advertisements

"THE COMMONWEALTH,"

A WEEKLY PAPER, BOSTON, MASS.,

as hitherto, will be profoundly attentive to all the issues pertaining to the settlement of our great civil contest, maintaining its position as

AN INDEPENDENT REPUBLICAN JOURNAL,

having an interest, also, in all that relates to LITERATURE, ART and NEWS.

TERMS.—Three dollars per annum. Subscriptions received for six months. Specimen copies sent *gratis* upon application.

CHARLES W. SLACK,

EDITOR AND PUBLISHER,

Office, 8 Bromfield Street, Boston, Mass.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS

FOR EVERY VARIETY OF AMPUTATION.

The most approved apparatus for exsections of the arm an leg, ununited fractures and shortened limbs, to restore them.

U. S. Army and Navy furnished by Commission of Surgeon-General U. S. Army.

Pamphlets and references s

SIR JOSHUA AND HOLBEIN.

BY JOHN RUSKIN.

From the Saturday Press.

Long ago discarded from our National Gallery, with the contempt logically due to national or English pictures,—lost to sight and memory for many a year in the Ogygian seclusions of Marlborough House—there have reappeared at last (1860) in more honorable exile at Kensington, two great pictures by Sir Joshua Reynolds. Two, with others; but these alone worth many an entanglement among the cross-roads of the West, to see for half an hour by Spring sunshine; — the Holy Family, and the Graces, side by side now in the principal room. Great as ever was work wrought by man. In placid strength, and subtlest science, unsurpassed;—in sweet felicity, incomparable.

If you truly want to know what good work of painter's hand is, study those two pictures from side to side, and miss no inch of them (you will hardly, eventually, be inclined to miss one); in some respects there is no execution like it; none so open in the magic. For the work of other great men is hidden in its wonderfulness—you cannot see how it was done. But in Sir Joshua's there is no mystery: it is all amazement. No question but that the touch was so laid; only that it could have been so laid, is a marvel forever. So also there is no painting so majestic in sweetness. He is illy-sceptred; his power blossoms, but burdens not. All other men of equal dignity paint more slowly; all others of equal force, paint less lightly. Tintoret lays his line like a king marking the boundaries of conquered lands; but Sir Joshua leaves it as a Summer wind its trace on a lake; he could have painted on a silken veil, where it fell free, and not bent it.

Such, at least, is his touch when it is life that he paints; for things lifeless, he has a severer hand. If you examine that picture of the Graces, you will find it reverses all the ordinary ideas of expedient treatment. By other men flesh is firmly painted, but accessories lightly. Sir Joshua paints accessories firmly,* flesh lightly;—nay, flesh not at all, but spirit. The wreath of flowers he feels to be material; and gleam by gleam strikes fearlessly the silver and violet leaves out of the darkness. But the three maidens are less substantial than rose-petals. No flushed nor frosted tissue that ever faded in night-wind is so tender as they; no hue may reach, no line measure, what is in them so gracious and so fair. Let the hand move softly—itself as a spirit; for this is Life, of which it touches the imagery.

"And yet——"

Yes: you do well to pause. There is a "yet" to be thought of. I did not bring you to these pictures to see wonderful work merely, or womanly beauty merely. I brought you chiefly to look at that Madonna, believing that you might remember other Madonnas, unlike her, and might think it desirable to consider wherein the difference lay:—other Madonnas, not by Sir Joshua, who painted Madonnas but seldom. Who, perhaps, if truth must be told, painted them never; for surely this dearest pet of an English girl, with the little curl of lovely hair under her ear, is not one.

Why did not Sir Joshua—or could not—or would not Sir Joshua—paint Madonnas? neither he nor his great rival-friend Gainsborough? Both of them painters of women, such as since Giorgione and Correggio had not been; both painters of men, such as had not been since Titian. How is it that these English friends can so brightly paint that particular order of humanity which we call "gentlemen and ladies," but neither heroes, nor saints, nor angels? Can it be because they were both country-bred boys, and forever after strangely sensitive to courtliness? Why, Giotto also was a country-bred boy. Allegri's native Correggio, Titian's Cadore, were but hill villages; yet these men painted, not the court, nor the drawing-room, but the Earth; and not a little of Heaven besides, while our good Sir Joshua never trusts himself outside the park palings. He could not even have drawn the strawberry girl, unless she had got through a gap in them—or rather, I think, she must have been let in at the porter's lodge, for her strawberries are in a pottle, ready for the ladies at the Hall. Giorgione would have set them, wild and fragrant, among their leaves, in her hand. Between his fairness, and Sir Joshua's May-fairness, there is a strange, impassable limit—as of the white reef that in Pacific isles encircles their inner lakelets, and shuts them from the surf and sound of sea. Clear and calm they rest, reflecting fringed shadows of the palm-strees, and the passing of fretted clouds across their own sweet circle of blue sky. But beyond, and round and round their coral bar, lies the blue of Sea and Heaven together—blue of eternal deep.

You will find it a pregnant question, if you follow it forth, and leading to many others, not trivial, why it is, that in Sir Joshua's girl, or Gainsborough's, we always think first of the Ladyhood; but in Giotto's, of the Womanhood? Why, in Sir Joshua's hero, or Vandyck's, it is always the Prince or the Sir whom we see first; but in Titians, the man.

Not that Titian's gentlemen are less finished than Sir Joshua's; but their gentlemanliness † is not the principal thing about them; their manhood absorbs, conquers, wears it as a despised thing. Nor—and this is another stern ground of separation—will Titian make a gentlemen of every one he paints. He will make him so if he is so, not otherwise: and this not merely in general servitude to truth, but because in his sympathy with deeper humanity, the courtier is not more interesting to him than any one else. "You have learned to dance and fence; you can speak with clearness, and think with precision; your hands are small, your senses acute, and your features well shaped. Yes; I see all this in you, and will do it justice. You shall stand as none but a well-bred man could stand; and your fingers shall fall on the sword-hilt as no fingers could but those that knew the grasp of it. But for the rest, this grisly fisherman, with rusty check and rope-frayed hand, is a man as well as you, and might possibly make several of you if souls were divisible. His bronze color is quite as interesting to me, Titian, as your paleness, and his hoary spray of stormy hair takes the light as well as your waving curls. Him also will I paint, with such picturesqueness as he may have; yet not putting the picturesqueness first in him as in you I have not put the gentlemanliness first. In him I see a strong human creature, contending with all hardship: in you also a human creature, uncontending, and possibly not strong. Contention or strength, weakness or picturesqueness, and all other such accidents in either, shall have due place. But the immortality and miracle of you—this clay that burns, this color that changes—are in truth the awful things in both; these shall be first painted—and last."

With which question respecting treatment of character we have to connect also this further one: How is it that the attempts of so great painters as Reynolds and Gainsborough are, beyond portraiture, limited almost like children's. No domestic drama—no history—no noble natural scenes, far less any religious subject:—only market-carts: girls with pigs; woodmen going home to supper; watering-places; grey cart-horses in fields, and such like. Reynolds, indeed, once or twice touched higher themes—"among the chords his fingers laid," and recoiled: wisely; for strange to say, his very sensibility deserts him when he leaves his courtly quiet. The horror of the subjects he chose (Cardinal Beaufort and Ugolino) showed inherent apathy: had he felt deeply, he would not have sought for this strongest possible excitement of feeling—he would not willingly have dwelt on the worst conditions of despair—the despair of the ignoble. His religious subjects are conceived even with less care than these. Beautiful as it is, this Holy Family by which we stand has neither dignity nor sacredness, other than those which attach to every group of gentle mother and ruddy babe; while his Faiths, Charities, or other well-ordered and emblem-fitted virtues, are even less lovely than his ordinary portraits of women.

It was a faultful temper, which, having so mighty a power of realization at command, never became so much interested in any fact of human history as to spend one touch of heart-felt skill upon it;—which, yielding momentarily to indolent imagination, ended, at best, in a Puck, or a Thais; a Mercury as Thief, or a Cupid as Linkboy. How wide the interval between this gently trivial humor, guided by the wave of a feather, or arrested by the enchantment of a smile—and the habitual dwelling of the thoughts of the great Greeks and Florentines among the beings and the interests of the eternal world.

In some degree it may indeed be true that the modesty and sense of the English painters are the causes of their simple practice. All that they did, they did well, and attempted nothing over which conquest was doubtful. They knew they could paint men and women: it did not follow that they could paint angels. Their own gifts never appeared to them so great as to call for serious question as to the use to be made of them. "They could mix colors and catch likeness—yes; but were they therefore able to teach religion, or reform the world? To support themselves honorably, pass the hours of life happily, please their friends, and leave no enemies, was not this all that duty could require, or prudence recommend? Their own art was, it seemed, difficult enough to employ all their genius: was it reasonable to hope also to be poets or theologians? Such men had, indeed, existed; but the age of miracles and prophets was long past; nor, because they could seize the trick of an expression, or the turn of a head, had they any right to think themselves able to conceive heroes with Homer, or gods with Michael Angelo?"

Such was, in the main, their feeling; wise, modest, unenvious, and unambitious. Meaner men, their contemporaries or successors, raved of high art with incoherent passion; arrogated to themselves an equality with the masters of elder time, and declaimed against the degenerate tastes of a public which acknowledged not the return of the Heraclidæ. But the two great—the two only painters of their age—happy in a reputation founded as deeply in the heart as in the judgment of makind, demanded no higher function than that of soothing the domestic affections; and achieved for themselves at last an immortality not the less noble, because in their lifetime they had concerned themselves less to claim it than to bestow.

Yet, while we acknowledge the discretion and simple-heartedness of these men, honoring them for both: and the more when we compare their tranquil powers with the hot egotism and hollow ambition of their inferiors: we have to remember, on the other hand, that the measure they thus set to their aims was, if a just, yet a narrow one; that amiable discretion is not the highest virtue, nor to please the frivolous, the best success. There is probably some strange weakness in the painter, and some fatal error in the age, when in thinking over the examples of their greatest work, for some type of culminating loveliness or veracity, we remember no expression either of religion or heroism, and instead of reverently naming a Madonna di San Sisto, can only whisper, modestly, "Mrs. Pelham feeding chickens."

The nature of the fault so far as it exists in the painters themselves, may perhaps best be discerned by comparing them with a man who went not far beyond them in his general range of effort, but who did all his work in a wholly different temper—Hans Holbein.

The first great difference between them is of course in completeness of execution. Sir Joshua's and Gainsborough's work, at its best, is only magnificent sketching; giving, indeed, in places, a perfection of result unattainable by other methods, and possessing always a charm of grace and power exclusively its own: yet, in its slightness addressing itself, purposely, to the casual glance, and common thought—eager to arrest the passer-by, but careless to detain him; or detaining him, if at all, by an unexplained enchantment, not by continuance of teaching, or development of idea. But the work of Holbein is true and thorough; accomplished, in the highest as the most literal sense, with a calm entireness of unaffected resolution, which sacrifices nothing, forgets nothing, and fears nothing.

In the portrait of the Hausmann George Gyzen,* every accessory is perfect with a fine perfection; the carnations in the glass vase by his side—the ball of gold, chased with blue enamel, suspended on the wall—the books—the steelyard—the papers on the table, the seal-ring, with its quartered bearings—all intensely there, and there in beauty of which no one could have dreamed that even flowers or gold were capable, far less parchment or steel. But every change of shade is felt, every rich and rubied line of petal followed; every subdued gleam in the soft blue of the enamel and bending of the gold touched with a hand whose patience of regard creates rather than paints. The jewel itself was not so precious as the rays of enduring light which form it, and flash from it, beneath that errorless hand. The man himself, what he was—not more; but to all conceivable proof of sight—in all aspect of life or thought—not less. He sits alone in his accustomed room, his common work laid out before him; he is conscious of no presence, assumes no dignity, bears no sudden or superficial look of care or interest, lives only as he lived—but forever.

The time occupied in painting this portrait was probably twenty times greater than Sir Joshua ever spent on a single picture, however large. The result is, to the general spectator, less attractive. In some qualities of force and grace it is absolutely inferior. But it is inexhaustible. Every detail of it wins, retains, rewards the attention with a continually increasing sense of wonderfulness. It is also wholly true. So far as it reaches, it contains the absolute facts of color, form, and character, rendered with an unaccusable faithfulness. There is no question respecting things which it is best worth while to know, or things which it is unnecessary to state, or which might be overlooked with advantage. What of this man and his house were visible to Holbein, are visible to us; we may despise if we will; deny or doubt, we shall not; if we care to know anything concerning them, great or small, so much as may by the eye be known is forever knowable, reliable, indisputable.

Respecting the advantage, or the contrary, of so great earnestness in drawing a portrait of an uncelebrated person, we raise at present no debate; I only wish the reader to note this quality of earnestness as entirely separating Holbein from Sir Joshua,—raising him into another sphere of intellect. For here is no question of mere difference in style or in power, none of minuteness or largeness. It is a question of Entireness. Holbein is "complete" in intellect; what he sees he sees with whole soul; what he paints, he paints with his his whole might. Sir Joshua sees partially, slightly, tenderly—catches the flying lights of things, the momentary glooms; paints also partially, tenderly, never with half his strength; content with uncertain visions, insecure delights; the truth not precious nor significant to him, only pleasing; falsehood also pleasurable, even useful on occasion—must, however, be discreetly touched, just enough to make all men noble, all women lovely; "we do not need this flattery often, most of those we know being such; and it is a pleasant world, and with diligence—for nothing can be done without diligence—every day till four" (says Sir Joshua)—"a painter's is a happy life."

Yes; and the Isis, with her swans, and shadows of Windsor Forest, is a sweet stream, touching her shores softly. The Rhine at Basle is of another temper, stern and deep, as strong, however bright its face; winding far through the solemn plain, beneath the slopes of Jura, tufted and steep; sweeping away into its regardless calm of current the waves of that little brook of St. Jacob, that bathe the Swiss Thermopylæ;† the low village nestling beneath a little bank of sloping fields—its spire seen white against the deep blue shadows of the Jura pines.

Gazing on that scene day by day, Holbein went his own way, with the earnestness and silent swell of the strong river—not unconscious of the awe, nor of the sanctities of this life. The snows of the eternal Alps giving forth their strength to it; the blood of the St. Jacob brook poured into it as it passes by—not in vain. He also could feel his strength coming from white snows far off in heaven. He also bore upon him the purple stain of the earth's sorrow. A grave man, knowing, what steps of men keep truest time to the chanting of Death. Having grave friends also;—the same singing heard far off, it seems to me, or perhaps, even low in the room, by that family of Sir Thomas More; or mingling with that hum of bees in the meadows outside the towered wall of Basle; or making the words of the book more tunable, which meditative Erasmus looks upon. Nay, that same soft Death-music is on the lips even of Holbein's Madonna. Who, among many, is the Virgin you had best compare with the one before whose image we have stood so long.

Holbein is at Dresden, accompanied by the Madonna di San Sisto; but both are visible enough to you here, for, by a strange coincidence, they are (at least so far as I know) the only two great pictures in the world which have been faultlessly engraved.

The received tradition respecting the Holbein Madonna is beautiful; and I believe the interpretation to be true. A father and mother have prayed to her for the life of their sick child. She appears to them, her own Christ in her arms. She puts down her Christ beside them—takes their child into her arms instead. It lies down upon her bosom, and stretches its hand to its father and mother, saying farewell.

This interpretation of the picture has been doubted, as nearly all the most precious truths of pictures have been doubted and forgotten. But even supposing it erroneous, the design is not less characteristic of Holbein. For that there are signs of suffering on the features of the child in the arms of the Virgin, is beyond question; and if this child be intended for the Christ, it would not be doubtful to my mind, that of the two—Raphael and Holbein—the latter had given the truest aspect and deepest reading of the early life of the Redeemer. Raphael sought to express His power only; but Holbein His labor and sorrow.

There are two other pictures which you should remember together with this (attributed, indeed, but with no semblance of probability, to the elder Holbein, none of whose work, preserved at Basle, or elsewhere, approaches in the slightest degree to their power), the St. Barbara and St. Elizabeth.* I do not know among the pictures of the sacred school any at once so powerful, so simple, so pathetically expressive of the need of the heart that conceived them. Not ascetic, nor quaint, nor feverishly or fondly passionate, nor wrapt in with drawn solemnities of thought. Only entirely true—entirely pure. No depth of glowing heaven beyond them—but the clear, sharp sweetness of the northern air; no splendor of rich color striving to adorn them with better brightness than of the day; a gray glory, as of moonlight without mist, dwelling on face and fold of dress;—all faultlessly fair. Creatures they are, humble by nature, not by self-condemnation; merciful by habit, not by tearful impulse; lofty without consciouaness; gentle without weakness; wholly in this present world, doing its work calmly; beautiful with all that holiest life can reach—yet already freed from all that holiest death can cast away.

*Pinacothek of Munich.

* As showing gigantic power of hand, joined with utmost accuracy and rapidity, the folds of drapery under the breast of the Virgin are, perhaps, as marvellous a piece of work as could be found in any picture, of whatever time or master.

† The reader must observe that I use the word here in a limited sense, as meaning only the effect of careful education, good society, and refined habits of life, on average temper and character. Of deep and true gentlemanliness—based as it is on intense sensibility and sincerity, perfected by courage and other qualities of race, as well as of that union of insensibility with cunning which is the essence of vulgarity, I shall have at length to speak in another place.

* Museum of Berlin.

† Of 1,200 Swiss, who fought by that brookside, ten only returned. The battle checked the attack of the French, led by Louis XI. (then Dauphin in 1444) and was the first of the great series of efforts and victories which were closed at Nancy by the death of Charles of Burgundy.

WHAT THE BLIND CAN DO.

[The recent number of the London *Quarterly Review* contains a very interesting article on the Training of the Blind, from which we make the following extracts:]

In the year 1712, in one of the Fellows' rooms at Christ's College, Cambridge, sat three learned and famous men discussing a knotty point over the Winter fire. Two of them were antiquaries as well as scholars, and on the table before them lay a small drawer of Roman coins, concerning some of which the battle waxed hot. Over one headless emperor, whose very name and date none but the initiated could guess at from the coin before them, the discussion grew especially fierce. It had been purchased as a rare and matchless gem by the elder of the two collectors, who both agreed as to its extreme value, but differed as to its exact date.

Their friend by the fire took no part in the discussion, but, at last, when the coin was handed to him for examination and judgment, his answer was prompt and decided enough. Strange to say, he did not glance at the medal, but having felt it over very carefully with the tips of his fingers, he next applied it to his tongue. This done, he quietly laid the headless Augustus down on the table, saying as he did so, "50 B. C., or 88 A. D.; the thing isn't worth a shilling; I doubt very much its being gold, and I'm sure it isn't Roman;" and the next day proved that he was in the right. The thing that had been shown to him and detected was a clever counterfeit, got up for the occasion of an antiquarian sale, just as Roman coins were dug up a month or two ago in making the Thames embankment. Yet this keen judge was a blind man, and had never set eyes on a coin, good, bad or indifferent; having lost not only his eyesight, but even his very eye-balls, by the small-pox in 1682, when but a twelvemonth old. He was now Lucasian Professor of Mathematics in the first University of the world, a friend of Whiston, Halley, and Sir Isaac Newton, whose "Principia" formed the chief subject of his public lectures.

His whole life from boyhood had been one of striking interest, though we can do no more than touch on the few salient points which startle us in the career of a blind man. At the free school of Penninstone, in Yorkshire, and with the help of a reader and such few books as his father, an exciseman, could procure for him at home, by dint of unwearied perseverance, he managed to acquire such a knowledge of the classics as to master the works of Euclid, Archimedes, Diophantus and Newton, in their original Greek and Latin. This was all done before he was twenty; at twenty-five he was a famous teacher in Cambridge.

THE POWER OF TOUCH.

He has to become acquainted almost entirely by touch and ear, with a little help from a companion's longer experience. It is all so utterly new and strange to him, that for the first day or two he is entirely dependent on some pupil's or teacher's hand to get as far as the school-room, the chapel, dining-room, or basket-shop, all of which are widely apart. But within a week the chances are that out of his eighty blind fellow pupils he has chosen one as a companion, and probably his friend, for several years to come, who, if need be, convoys him across the open yard to any special point—to the dormitory, or through the more intricate navigation of staircase leading to the band-room. In a month all the plain sailing is fairly mastered. He can find his way from the dining-room to the basket-shop, and down that shop, one hundred and fifty yards long, just to the very site of his own box on which he sits to split the withes for basket-work. He knows his own box, too, from Smith's and Brown's on either side of him.

In a year he will know probably his own tools from theirs by some little flaw or feature not patent to the eye of a looker on; in a couple of years he will know the handle of the door to music-room No. 5 from that of No. 6; he will run quickly with a half-finished basket in his hand, from the workshop, across a wide yard, exactly to the very door-step of the open shed in which is a tank for soaking his willow-work. His sense of touch and hearing are being silently and surely educated; as their education progresses they become keener—hearing as a sharp and watchful sentinel, guide and spy; touch is his servant-of-all-work and detective. To the seeing touch is an auxiliary, but to the blind boy it is the primary sense of all. By it he knows his own clothes, and almost all the property that he possesses—his tools, box, bed, hat, fiddle, cupboard, seat in chapel, school-room, and workshop; by it he reads his chapter in St. John or in Robinson Crusoe; he plays chess or dominoes; works a sum in long division or writes a letter home to his mother which she can read with her eyes, and he with his fingers. By the help of touch he weaves a rug of colored wools embracing every variety of scroll-work, or of those peculiar flowers and fruits which grow only on carpet land, or fringes with delicate green and red a door-mat for a lady's boudoir; by touch he sees any curiosity, such as a lamp from the Pyramids, or a scrap of mineral, which you describe to him, and which, having once handled, he always speaks of as having been seen.

HOW THE BLIND WEAVE COLORED PATTERNS.

The weaver sets to work with a loom of the ordinary kind, which we therefore need not describe, and the only problem is, how shall the blind workman accurately follow a pattern of which he cannot see a single step, in colors which he cannot distinguish. We pause only for a moment, by the way, to notice one common and popular error still afloat, viz., that some clever blind people have the power of detecting colors by the touch. All we can say is that those who have had the experience of many years and opportunities for the personal examination of many hundreds of blind persons of all ages and ranks, including some of remarkable ability, have not been able to find the remotest trace of such a power. There is no more resemblance now between sounds and colors than in the time of Guillié, fifty years ago; so that no description will enable a blind man to discern between a crimson poppy and the azure corn-flower; nor can there be any perceptible difference of texture in one morsel of wool, paper, cloth or feather stained red and another of grassy green. Dr. Moyes, indeed, who lost his sight at three years of age, says that "red gave him a disagreeable sensation, like the touch of a saw," and that as other colors became less intense they decreased in harshness, until green conveyed to him an idea like that which he felt in passing his hand over a polished surface. But we suspect that Dr. Moyes was only trying to rival the happy shot of another blind man, who, says Locke, declared that scarlet was to him "like the sound of a trumpet." Trumpets and scarlet go well together, and were perhaps, even more frequently heard of and met with seventy or eighty years ago than they are now, and the name of one might well suggest the other.

A pupil of Guillié's, at the Paris Blind School, translated *rubente dexterâ*, from Horace's Second Ode, by "flaming right hand." Being pressed to translate literally, he gave as an equivalent "*red.*" When asked what he meant by "*a red arm,*" he said that he did not think, like Locke's blind man, that the color red was like the sound of a trumpet, but he had translated it "*flaming,*" because he had been told that fire was *red;* whence he concluded that heat is accompanied by redness, which determined him to mark the anger of Jupiter by the epithet flaming, because when irritated, one is hot, and when *hot,* one must be *red.*

Touch, therefore, which can do so much for the blind workman, can do nothing for him here; but, nevertheless, as the Great Exhibition proved, he can weave you a rug bright with all the colors of the rainbow, exactly after the pattern which you prescribe; scroll-work, leaves, fruit, flowers, lozenges, stars or cross-bars. In the first place, his threads of wool are all placed for him by his side, in one exact order, say white, crimson, blue, yellow and maron. They are always in the same order and place, so that he takes up whichever he needs, with unerring certainty. Hung up to the beam in front of him, but easily within reach of his fingers, is a square of smooth, thin deal, on which is traced the pattern of his rug in nails with heads of every possible variety of shape—round, square, diamond-shape, or triangular; tack, brads and buttons; some driven home to the surface of the board, others raised one-tenth of an inch above it; but all telling their own story of red, green, white or blue. The board is ruled thus with cross bar lines, and at every point of intersection a small hole is bored, into which is slipped a nail with its head square, round or triangular, as the pattern requires. The boy reads his pattern along the horizontal lines, from left to right, and according to the teaching of the nails weaves in the gay scroll-work of brilliant colors as deftly as if he saw every tint.

CURIOUS NOTIONS OF THE BLIND.

Touch, then, does much for the blind boy, but brings him not a single grain nearer to the discerning of color. Where, therefore, touch fails him, he can gain little external help, and many presently be altogether at sea. Things apparently identical in form may differ in size, may also totally differ in essence and in nature, and of this difference he may be wholly unconscious. He may form, and does form, the most outrageously incorrect ideas on some common matters, though he may continually amuse and surprise you by clever guesses, or gleams of what seems like intuition. Du Puiseaux, the son of a professor of philosophy in the University of Paris, was in some things the shrewdest man of his day, having attained considerable proficiency in botany and chemistry; but he was blind. He had a wonderful memory for sounds, and could, it is said, recognize by their voice persons whom he had only once heard. He could tell if he was in a street or a blind alley, in a large room or a small one; but he believed that astronomers were the only people who saw with telescopes, and that they had their eyes differently formed from other men. Nor was his notion about eyes in general a whit less incorrect. "The eye," said he, "is an organ on which the air should have the same effect as my stick on my hand." The boy upon whom Cheselden operated for cataract had clearly been of the same opinion.

Even when restored to sight, he believed that the objects he looked on touched his eyes, as those which he felt touched his skin; and he consequently had no true idea of distance. He asked, "Which was the sense that deceived him, the sight or the touch?" He wondered how a likeness of his father's face could be got into so small a space as his mother's watch-case; it seemed to him as impossible as getting a bushel into a pint measure. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that when some one asked Du Puiseaux if he would not be very glad to have his sight, he replied, "If it were not for my curiosity, I would rather have long arms; it seems to me that my hands would teach me better what is passing in the moon than your eyes or telescopes; and besides, the eye ceases to see oftener than the hands to touch. It would, therefore, be as well to improve the organ I have as to give me the one I want." Abundant evidence of a similar kind might still be adduced, but this seems enough to prove that even among educated blind people there must be a large section of the physical and metaphysical world of which their idea is to a great extent vague and worthless.

HOW TO KEEP A HOTEL.

Having travelled considerably in my time, I have thought some brief suggestions, short perhaps of a perfect manual on the subject, might be useful.

First, don't call it a tavern, or an inn, or a hotel even.

Call it a *House,* and name it after some great capitalist, big Indian, or Saint—"Morton-Peto House," or "Whoop-de-Doodle House," or "St. Bob-o-Link House," that sounds very well and will take the traveller's ear.

Nothing is so vulgar as to court bagmen's and trader's custom, as you will seem to do by naming your establishment "Merchants'," or "City," or "Commercial."

These suggest a second-class affair at once.

Be sure and establish an immense barber's shop on the ground floor.

It causes a grateful odor of the Balm of a Thousand Flowers and Night-Blooming Cereus to pervade the atmosphere, and effectually subdues and overcomes other and less agreeable smells, as for instance cockroaches and cookery.

If you can hire an Irishman cheap enough, let one man do nothing but swab the marble hall with greasy water all day long; it conveys an idea of cleanliness to the guests; at night, when few are about, it is of little consequence.

I said "guests," and here is a point you should by no means neglect.

Be careful in speaking of your lodgers, in printed notice and the like, to use that term.

It is refined, and puts them on their good behavior at once.

Procure a well-dressed clerk with curly, black hair, if possible, to stand at the desk, and by all means insist on his wearing diamonds.

Seedy visitors will take no liberties with such a man.

When a traveller comes in he is not to notice him for the space of five minutes at least; it puts the obligation at once where it belongs.

You take him in, not he you.

It is an excellent device to have the numbers of your chambers reversed from the old plan, *i.e.,* let them begin to count from the roof.

Thus when the guest sees the clerk put "No. 10," for instance, opposite his name on the register, he departs satisfied, and is too much exhausted and cowed by the time he discovers its whereabouts to make any complaint.

Instruct your clerk that it is not his business to know anything about departing trains and steamboats.

Also, if your House happens to be in a country town, to add $1 a day invariably to all New Yorkers' bills.

They will not think much of your House otherwise.

When a guest has paid his bill and is about to depart, let the clerk ask cheerily, "Which way do you go, Mr. Robinson?"

Some persons are so easily imposed upon, that the extraordinary fact of a highly-bedizened clerk's knowing their names two minutes after reading them on the register tickles them tremendously.

In regard to the dining-room, you cannot have too impudent an Irishman as head waiter.

It should be his duty when a guest enters the room, no matter how empty it may be, to take him in convoy, and make him walk the entire length of it before assigning him a seat.

It not only serves to impress the grandeur of the apartment upon him, but invariably disconcerts bashful men, so that they devour their meals meekly and make no troublesome requests.

Ladies should be served in the same way for exactly contrary reasons.

It affords them a fine opportunity to display their clothes, and puts them in good humor.

Let the sexes be kept religiously apart while feeding, unless in the case of husband and wife.

Married men travelling alone will suffer so much from the dearth of female society, that the next time they will probably bring their wives.

It will scarcely be necessary to make any suggestions in regard to extra charges in the bill, as they will naturally occur to the feeblest of landlords.

You should always, however, charge for a fire in Winter in every room that has conveniences for it, and if remonstrated with, reply that it is a "rule of the House," and the guest might have had it.

This phrase you will find of immense service on all sorts of occasions.

Let all your employés be particular to style the hotel omnibus a "coach," and a gent's wife his "lady."

These little elegancies cost nothing and gild the surface of life immensely.

Procure the largest Chinese gong you can find, to awaken your guests in the morning, and call them to meals.

They will conclude that your House is a stunning affair.

A negro will probably beat it more thoroughly than a white man.

Also, on the counter in the office, keep an immense hammer bell.

A judicious clerk will produce a very humbling effect upon a modest guest by striking it rapidly four or five times when he is asking absurd questions.

Follow these suggestions carefully, and you will go far to prove the truth of Emerson's aphorism that "travel is the fool's paradise."—*New York Saturday Press.*

THE GREAT STRENGTHENING TONIC,

(NOT A WHISKEY PREPARATION.)

HOOFLAND'S

GERMAN BITTERS,

WILL CURE

DEBILITY! DEBILITY!

Resulting from any cause whatsoever.

H

PROSTRATION OF THE SYSTEM

INDUCED BY

SEVERE HARDSHIPS,

EXPOSURE,

FEVERS,

OR

DISEASES OF CAMP LIFE.

SOLDIERS, CITIZENS, MALE OR FEMALE, ADULT OR YOUTH,

will find this Bitters a pure Tonic, not dependent on bad liquors for their almost miraculous effects.

O

DYSPEPSIA,

AND DISEASES RESULTING FROM DISORDERS OF THE LIVER AND DIGESTIVE ORGANS,

ARE CURED BY

HOOFLAND'S GERMAN BITTERS.

This Bitters has performed more cures, gives better satisfaction, has more testimony, has more respectable people to vouch for it, than any other article in the market.

O

We defy any one to contradict this assertion, and

WILL PAY $1,000

to any one who will produce a certificate published by us that is not genuine

HOOFLAND'S GERMAN BITTERS,

WILL CURE EVERY CASE OF

CHRONIC OR NERVOUS DEBILITY

AND

DISEASES OF THE KIDNEYS.

F

Observe, the following Symptoms, resulting from Disorders of the Digestive Organs:

Constipation, Inward Piles, Fulness of Blood to the Head, Acidity of the Stomach, Nausea, Heartburn, Disgust for Food, Fulness or Weight in the Stomach, Sour Eructations, Sinking or Fluttering at the Pit of the Stomach, Swimming of the Head, Hurried and Difficult Breathing, Fluttering at the Heart, Choking or Suffocating Sensations when in a lying posture, Dimness of Vision, Dots or Webs before the Sight, Fever and Dull Pain in the Head, Deficiency of Perspiration, Yellowness of the Skin and eyes, Pain in the Side, Back, Chest, Limbs, etc., Sudden Flushes of Heat, Burning in the Flesh, Constant Imaginings of Evil, Great Depression of Spirits.

L

REMEMBER,

that this Bitters is not Alcoholic, contains no Rum or Whiskey, and cannot make Drunkards, but is the Best Tonic in the World.

READ WHO SAYS SO.

* * * * * * * * *

[From the Rev. W. D. Seigfried, Pastor of Twelfth Baptist Church, Phil.]

Gentlemen: I have recently been laboring under the distressing effects of indigestion, accompanied by a prostration of the nervous system. Numerous remedies were recommended by friends, and some of them tested, but without relief. Your Hoofland's German Bitters were recommended by persons who had tried them, and whose favorable mention of these Bitters induced me to try them. I must confess that I had an aversion to Patent Medicines from the "thousand and one" quack "Bitters," whose only aim seems to be to palm off sweetened and drugged liquor upon the community in a sly way, and the tendency of which, I fear, is to make many a confirmed drunkard. Upon learning that yours was really a medicinal preparation, I took it, with happy effect. Its action, not only upon the stomach, but upon the nervous system, was prompt and gratifying. I feel that I have derived great and permanent benefit from the use of a few bottles.

Very respectfully yours,

W. D. SEIGFRIED, No. 254 Shackamaxon st.

A

[From the Rev. E. D. Fendall, Assistant Editor *Christian Chronicle,* Phil.]

I have derived decided benefit from the use of Hoofland's German Bitters, and feel it my privilege to recommend them as a most valuable tonic, to all who are suffering from general debility or from diseases arising from derangement of the liver.

Yours truly, E. D. FENDALL.

[From Rev. D. Merrige, Pastor of the Passyunk Baptist Church, Phil.]

From the many respectable recommendations given to Dr. Hoofland's German Bitters, I was induced to give them a trial After using several bottles I found them to be a good remedy for debility, and a most excellent tonic for the stomach.

D. MERRIGE.

From Rev. Wm. Smith, formerly Pastor of the Vincentown and Millville (N. J.) Baptist Churches.]

Having used in my family a number of bottles of your Hoofland's German Bitters, I have to say that I regard them as an excellent medicine, specially adapted to remove the diseases they are recommended for. They strengthen and invigorate the system when debilitated, and are useful in disorders of the liver, loss of appetite, etc. I have also recommended them to several of my friends, who have tried them, and found them greatly beneficial in the restoration of health.

Yours truly, WILLIAM SMITH,
966 Hutchinson street, Phil.

N

[From the Rev. Joseph H. Kennard, Pastor of the Tenth Baptist Church.]

I have been frequently requested to connect my name with commendations of different kinds of medicines, but regarding the practice as out of my appropriate sphere, I have in all cases declined; but with a clear proof in various instances, and particularly in my own family, of the usefulness of Dr. Hoofland's German Bitters, I depart for once from my usual course, to express my full conviction that, *for general debility of the system, and especially for Liver Complaint, it is a safe and valuable preparation.* In some cases it may fail; but usually, I doubt not, it will be very beneficial to those who suffer from the above causes.

Yours, very respectfully,
J. H. KENNARD, Eighth, below Coates st.

Philadelphia, Dec. 24, 1864.

Rev. J. S. Herman, of the German Reformed Church, Kutztown, Berks county, Pa., was cured of Dyspepsia of twenty years' standing.

A. M. Spangler, Editor of the *Culturist,* No. 26 North Sixth st., Philadelphia, says this Bitters was recommended to him by a medical friend, and six bottles cured him of complete prostration of the nervous system.

Rev. J. Newton Brown, D.D., Editor of the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge and *Christian Chronicle,* Phil.;

Rev. Thos. Winter, D.D., Pastor of Roxborough Baptist Church;

Rev. Levi G. Beck, Pastor of the Baptist Church, Pemberton, N. J., formerly of the North Baptist Church, Phil., at present Pastor of the Baptist Church, Chester, Pa.

These gentlemen express, in the strongest terms, their favorable opinion of these Bitters.

D

BEWARE OF COUNTERFEITS!

☞ See that the signature of "C. M. JACKSON" is on the wrapper of each bottle.

☞ Should your nearest Druggist not have the article, do not be put off by any other of the intoxicating preparations that may be offered in its place; but send to us, and we will forward, securely packed, by express.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE AND MANUFACTORY,

NO. 63 ARCH ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA

JONES & EVANS,

[Successors to C. M JACKSON & CO.,]

Proprietors.

For sale by Druggists and Dealers in every town in the United States.

CONSTITUTION

LIFE SYRUP,

COMPOSED OF

IODIDE POTASSIUM,

With the Compound Concentrated Fluid Extract of

VALUABLE MEDICINAL

ROOTS AND HERBS,

A positive and specific remedy for all diseases originating from an IMPURE STATE OF THE BLOOD, and for all (hereditary) DISEASES transmitted from PARENT TO CHILD.

SCROFULA

STRUMA.	GLANDULAR SWELLINGS.	ULCERATION.
KING'S EVIL.	ERYSIPELAS.	SALT RHEUM.

This taint (HEREDITARY and ACQUIRED), filling life with untold misery, is by all usual medical remedies incurable.

RHEUMATISM.

[ARTHRITIS.]	NEURALGIA.	GOUT.
LUMBAGO.	SCIATICA.	TIC DOLOUREUX.

If there is any disease in which the Constitution Life Syrup is a sovereign, it is in Rheumatism and its kindred affections. The most intense pains are almost immediately alleviated—enormous swellings are reduced. Cases, chronic or vicarious, of 20 or 30 years standing, have been cured by us.

NERVOUSNESS.

NERVOUS DEBILITY.	SHATTERED NERVES.	ST. VITUS' DANCE.
LOSS OF POWER.	CONFUSION OF THOUGHTS.	EPILEPSY.

Thousands who have suffered for years will bless the day on which they read these lines. Particularly to weak, suffering woman will this medicine prove an inestimable blessing—directing their footsteps to a Hope which fulfils more than it promises.

MERCURIAL DISEASES.

SALIVATION.	ROTTING OF BONES.
BAD COMPLEXION.	ACHES IN BONES.
FEELING OF WEARINESS.	DEPRESSION OF SPIRITS.

CONSTITUTION LIFE SYRUP purges the system entirely from all the evil effects of MERCURY, removing the Bad Breath, and curing the Weak Joints and Rheumatic Pains which the use of Calomel is sure to produce. It hardens Spongy Gums and secures the teeth as firmly as ever.

Constitution Life Syrup

eradicates, root and branch, all Eruptive Diseases of the Skin, like

ULCERS, PIMPLES, BLOTCHES,

and all other difficulties of this kind, which so much disfigure the outward appearance of both males and females, often making them a disgusting object to themselves and their friends.

Constitution Life Syrup

cures all Swelling of the Glands, either of the Face, Neck, or Female Breast, and should be taken as soon as the swelling is detected, thus preventing their breaking, and producing troublesome Discharging Sores, which disfigure so many of the younger portion of the community, from six to tw